

are devoted to these topics, particularly to the idea of founding a seminary designed to train enthusiasts for this task. There are articles on Arab nationalism, on relations between Turks and Arabs and on the need to ensure for the Arabic language a land of freedom where it may flourish; Islam cannot in fact survive without it, especially at a time when the Turks are adopting a hostile linguistic policy. Similarly, the *Manār* enables us to follow the affair of the caliphate and the upheavals caused by its suppression by the Turks in 1924 [see **KHILĀFA**].

There are articles describing various personalities of the Muslim world, mostly Arab. Attitudes towards Shīʿism are discussed. Polemic is directed as much against liberal Muslims (cf. that against the *Siyāsa*, which supported Ṭāhā Ḥusayn, etc.) as against al-Azhar. There is news relating to the pilgrimage, the construction of the Ḥidjāz railway, the wars in Tripolitania, in the Rif, etc., as well as European colonial policy, particularly in regard to the Syrian question after 1918, the Coptic Congress in Asyut in 1911, the Muslim Congresses of Cairo, of Mecca, etc.; relations with the Christians, their doctrine, missions of Western Christians, Western writers sympathetic to Islam, studies on the greatness and decadence of nations, on pedagogy, on the role of the ʿulamāʾ in the Muslim renaissance, etc. Literary and cultural Arab news items are not lacking. The judicial discussions tackle various difficulties, some of them relevant to the modern world, mentioning the position of Muḥammad ʿAbduh (cf. for example the question of the Savings Bank). In short, the periodical contained material suitable for learned and illuminating monographs.

The commentary on the Kurʿān published from the third year onward was the work of Rashīd Riḍā; it included lengthy extracts from the commentary expounded by Muḥammad ʿAbduh in evening lectures at al-Azhar, and the respective contributions of the two men were clearly distinguished. ʿAbduh went no further than v. 125 of sūra IV (*al-Nisāʾ*) whereas Riḍā continued to the end of sūra XII, (*Yūsuf*, v. 107). Some of the positions adopted were daring: ʿAbduh maintained that the texts of the Jewish Scriptures and of the Gospels were authentic and that only their interpretation had been false (Riḍā denied their authenticity); he claimed that the execution of the Muslim apostate was a measure dating from a time of war during which apostasy constituted desertion in the face of the enemy—today this is not the case and the apostate who does not attack Islam should not be put to death; it is for God to punish him. These examples and other show how ʿAbduh sought to re-open the door of *iqṭihād*. Reference to all these allusions are to be found in the studies mentioned in the bibliography.

Although a positive and very important work in the context of the modern Muslim awakening, it should be noted that the *Manār* sometimes confined itself to schematic views of an apologetic nature, simplifying in extreme fashion certain historical problems, notably those of the causative influences which helped to bring about the Renaissance of Europe. It also used its influence on behalf of the Gospel of Barnabas, "this undoubtedly apocryphal work" according to L. Massignon, edited for the first time in the 14th century and later in the 16th, sponsoring its translation into Arabic in 1908. This apologetic must have responded to a deeply-felt need, for it enjoyed, and still enjoys, enormous success, even if it contributed little to imparting a sense of objectivity and of history to those who studied it. Similarly, the *Manār* seems to have ignored a fundamental question: did the adop-

tion of Western techniques not also entail a certain change of mentality, and if so, what? It thus remained silent on one of the key problems posed by the very existence of technological civilisation.

Bibliography: Rashīd Riḍā, *Taʾrīkh al-Ustādh al-Imām*, 3 vols., Cairo; the 35 volumes of the review *al-Manār* itself, as well as texts reprinted separately, such as *Fatāwā ʿl-Imām Muḥammad Rashīd Riḍā*, 6 vols., Beirut 1961-2, or from Cairo, *al-Manār* printing house: *Tafsīr al-Manār*, 12 vols.; *al-Manār wa ʿl-Azhar*, 1353/1934-5; *al-Khilāfa aw al-Imāma al-ʿuzmā*, 1341/1923. Numerous references to *al-Manār* articles are to be found in the notes accompanying the translation of the latter work by H. Laoust, under the title *Le califat dans la doctrine de Rashīd Riḍā*, Beirut 1938. The most important study of the subject is H. Laoust, *Le Réformisme orthodoxe des "Salafiya"*, in *REI* (1932), 175-224. See also J. Jomier, *Le Commentaire coranique du Manār*, Paris 1954; idem, *Les raisons de l'adhésion du Sayyid Rashīd Riḍā au nationalisme arabe*, in *Bulletin Inst. d'Égypte*, liii-liv, 53-61; idem, *L'Imam Mohammad ʿAbduh et la Caisse d'Épargne (1903-1904)*, in *Revue de l'Occident Musulman et de la Méditerranée* (1973), 99-107. For the influence of *al-Manār* on the ʿulamāʾ of Algeria, see Ali Merad, *Le Réformisme musulman en Algérie de 1925 à 1940*, Paris 1967. (J. JOMIER)

MANĀRA, MANĀR (A.) minaret.

1. In the Islamic lands between the Maghrib and Afghanistan.

Unlike the other types of Islamic religious building, such as the mosque and the *madrasa*, the minaret is immediately and unambiguously recognisable for what it is. The reasons for this are worth investigating. It seems on the whole unrelated to its function of the *adhān* [*q.v.*] calling the faithful to prayer, which can be made quite adequately from the roof of the mosque or even from a house-top. During the lifetime of the Prophet, his Abyssinian slave Bilāl [*q.v.*], was responsible for making the call to prayer in this way. The practice continued for another generation, a fact which demonstrates that the minaret is not an essential part of Islamic ritual. To this day, certain Islamic communities, especially the most orthodox ones like the Wahhābis in Arabia, avoid building minarets on the grounds that they are ostentatious and unnecessary. Others are content with the so-called "staircase" minarets which consist simply of a few broad external steps leading to a diminutive kiosk a little above roof level. These perpetuate a practice common in the first century of Islam. While such structures are obviously functional, it is very doubtful whether the same can be said for any minaret much more than 15 m. high. Without mechanical amplification, the human voice simply cannot make itself heard, especially in a noisy urban setting, from the top of such celebrated minarets as the Giralda in Seville [see **ISHBĪLIYA**: 2. Historic buildings] or the Kuṭb Minār [*q.v.*] in Dihli.

If then, the ostensible function of the minaret is somewhat misleading, what other purposes might it have served? If the investigation confines itself in the first instance to the early minarets of the Islamic world—i.e. those predating 1000 A.D.—three possible approaches may be suggested. One is to examine the role of the very earliest minarets in their particular historical setting, on the theory that these examples laid down guidelines for the further development of the form. Another is to see what clues lie in the Arabic words used for minaret, and in their etymology. A third approach would focus on the forms of these early minarets and on their immediate sources, and would

thus involve the assumption that at least traces of the earlier functions associated with these forms survived into the Islamic period. It must be remembered, however, that throughout the mediaeval period, the rôle of the minaret oscillated between two polarities: as a sign of power and as an instrument for the *adhān*. These functions were not mutually exclusive.

It will be convenient to begin by studying the circumstances in which the earliest minarets were built. According to the literary evidence, the first minaret was erected in ca. 45/665 by the governor of 'Irāk Ziyād b. Abīhi [*q.v.*]: a stone tower (*manāra*) was added to the mosque at Baṣra. Soon afterwards, orders were given by the caliph Mu'āwiya to the governor of Egypt, and the mosque of 'Amr at Fuṣṭāṭ was given a quartet of *ṣawāmi'*, whilst these were also added to other mosques in Egypt. Although nothing remains of these structures, this literary evidence is important in showing that the impetus to build was not a matter of local initiative but came from the highest power in the land, the idea emanating from Syria, where minarets were presumably added to at least some Syrian mosques at this time. It is hard not to see religio-political motives at work here. Christian Syria, within which the Muslims formed a few small enclaves, was lavishly endowed with fine stone churches whose most striking external feature was a tall tower. At the top of these towers was struck the *simandron*—the Orthodox equivalent of the church bell—to summon worshippers for divine service. Some attribute the change in the *adhān* to 'Umar, but Mu'āwiya, sensitively attuned as he was to the discrepancies between Christian and Muslim culture, and to the need to reconcile them wherever possible, can scarcely have failed to compare this Christian practice with its simpler Islamic equivalent. It would have been wholly in character for him to have decided to secure for the *adhān* a dignity and formality it had not hitherto possessed by giving it monumental expression. Typically, too, that expression borrowed a Christian form but imbued it with a new Muslim meaning. The slightly later case of the Dome of the Rock leaps to mind as the obvious parallel. The intrusion of political concerns into the forms of early Islamic religious architecture was to be a hallmark of the Umayyad period.

The arguments set out above are susceptible to more than one interpretation. They could support the theory that these early, essentially redundant, minarets were intended simply to demonstrate to the local non-Muslims that the new faith was no less capable than its rivals of devising monumental architecture to glorify itself. However, they could also imply the conclusion that from its very beginning the minaret was intended to function as an outward sign of Islam. A usage formulated in response to a hostile environment would then gradually have become canonical and would have persisted even when circumstances had overtaken the need for it. These two interpretations will be considered in more detail below in the context of the form of the earliest minarets.

The second possibly approach to the original function of the minaret is through the etymology of the words used in Arabic to describe this kind of building. It is perhaps significant that the three words most commonly used—*manāra*, *ṣawma'a* and *mi'dhana*—all arguably refer to quite separate functional aspects of the building. Thus the notion that the minaret served multiple functions is embedded in the Arabic language itself. These functions quite naturally generated appropriate terms for themselves. Whether the prevalence of a given term in a given geographical

area reflects the predominance of one function over another is, however, doubtful.

By far the commonest of the three terms is *manār(a)*, the source via Turkish of English and French "minaret", lit. "place of fire" (*nār*), a word used in pre-Islamic Arabia to denote an elevated place from which signals of fire or smoke were made. Whence the frequent education of the minaret with the lighthouse [see preceding article MANĀR]; the cylindrical towers attached to Islamic fortresses along parts of the North African littoral, e.g. in Tunisia, not only served as beacons and lighthouses but were actually called *manāras*. One should, on the other hand, avoid any temptation to connect *manār(a)* with *nūr* "light" and to discern a basis for symbolic interpretation of the minaret as an emanation of divine light or as an image of spiritual illumination. The original term *manār(a)* soon lost its necessary connection with fire, and became used to designate signposts, boundary stones or markers, and watch-towers when no particular association with fire was intended. Hence there emerges that *manār(a)* came to involve the two distinct notions of fire and of a marker, neither of which, however, had a specific role in Islamic ritual. The lighting of a fire on the minaret of a mosque was an event of utmost rarity in early Islam (it is recorded as having occurred in the case of the Manārat al-'Arūs in the Damascus mosque), though it is self-evident that the minaret had a value as marker of the principal building of the Islamic community. It seems therefore safe to assume that, in the context of religious architecture, the association between the minaret and fire is irrelevant.

The second term frequently used to designate the minaret—indeed, it is the standard usage in North Africa—is *ṣawma'a*. The word means the cell in which a person (usually a monk) secludes himself, with the particular gloss that the cell has a slender pointed apex. Such cells were a regular feature of pre-Islamic Byzantine architecture; they were incorporated into the tall rectangular towers with which churches, monasteries and houses were furnished. Once again, however, as in the case of *manāra*, the etymology is apt to mislead—for while the basic meaning of *ṣawma'a* is indeed "hermitage", the word has come to designate, by a process of *pars pro toto*, the entire structure of which the cell was a small part. The specific connotation of *ṣawma'a* in the present context is perhaps a "sentry-box" minaret, and eventually a tall, rectangular minaret, rather than the minaret genre itself. For this reason, it is an entirely appropriate term for the minarets of North Africa. Moreover, unlike the word *manāra*, its connotations are religious, albeit with a Christian tinge. Possibly as a result of its association with the minaret, the word is also used more generally to mean "a higher place" or even "a high building", and in this less specific since its connection with *manāra* in the sense of signal tower or marker is plain. In North Africa, however, a distinction clearly exists, for *manāra* is used for signal towers and lighthouses. Appropriately enough in view of its Christian connotations, *ṣawma'a* has found a lodging in Europe, in the Spanish word *zoma* meaning "minaret".

It is a challenging reflection that the two Arabic words most frequently used to designate the minaret give no clue to the ritual function commonly associated with the building. Instead, they evoke respectively pre-Islamic and Christian associations. The term that does accurately render the ritual function of the building—*mi'dhana*—is, ironically enough, much rarer than the other two, suggesting, perhaps, that earlier "minarets"/*manāras* had functions not ex-

clusively ritual. It derives of course from *adhān*, hence literally "place from which the call to prayer is made", whose root further gives *mu'adhḍhin* "muezzin, he who gives the call to prayer". Even this last has pre-Islamic connections, for in the Djāhiliyya the herald who made important announcements was known as the *mu'adhḍhin*. Before leaving the problem of etymology, it may be worth noting that several other words occur sporadically in literary or epigraphic texts as synonyms for at least some of the meanings of *manāra*: 'alam/alama ("signpost", "boundary maker", "standing stone", "flag"), *mīl* (possibly derived from the Greek *miliarion*, "milestone") and 'asās, "a place of watching", a term especially popular in the Maghrib. The mere mention of these words in the context of the foregoing discussion is enough to emphasise yet again that etymology is a somewhat treacherous guide in determining the function of the minaret. It can safely be asserted, however, that the review of Arabic terminology given above establishes that the minaret performed not one function but several in the mediaeval Islamic world. Whilst the rarer Arabic words for "minaret" may well reflect the function of the building in the particular context concerned, the most commonly employed word, *manāra*, was obviously a blanket term which does not readily lend itself to precise elucidation, unless the context offers further, more specific, clues.

The third possible approach to determining the function of the minaret in the early centuries of Islam is by way of morphology. The briefest survey of the formal characteristics of mediaeval minarets is enough to yield one very significant result: that virtually the whole body of surviving minarets belongs to one of two categories. One category comprises minarets with ample interior space; the other, minarets in which the interior space is reduced to the bare minimum required for a spiral staircase to ascend the structure. Minarets with external staircases obviously belong in neither category. Useful as this division is, it cannot shed light on the crucial first century of Islam. Any attempt to explain the function of the minaret by means of its form has to take some account of the earliest recorded minarets, even though none of these has survived. The interpretation placed on the tantalising brief literary accounts which refer to the earliest minarets is therefore crucial.

These accounts are unfortunately either ambivalent or too short to throw any light on the problem. For example, the historian al-Balāḍhurī refers to the minaret at Baṣra as a stone minaret. Since stone is specified and the rest of the mosque was of mud brick, it seems legitimate to conclude that the minaret was important enough to have special care taken over its construction. This, then, seems to be a fairly straightforward case. The same cannot be said for the minarets of the mosque of 'Amr at Fuṣṭāṭ. The source here is the 9th/15th century author al-Maḳrīzī, who states that Mu'āwiya ordered the building of four *ṣawāmi'* (pl. of *ṣawma'a*) for the call to prayer, and that Maslama placed four *ṣawāmi'* in the corners of the mosque. Since this is not, in all probability, the first word for minaret that would have come naturally to the Mamlūk historian's mind, its use in this passage needs some explanation. It is possible that al-Maḳrīzī used it deliberately because it connoted to him tall, rectangular minarets of the Syrian or Maghribī type (very unlike those which he saw all around him in Egypt). His choice of word would in that case have reflected either his own or his source's precise knowledge of the form which these early Umayyad

minarets took; or he may have been quoting an earlier text. Alternatively, he may have used the word *ṣawāmi'* with one of his other meanings in mind, such as a high place. In that case, the sense of the passage might be more accurately rendered by translating the key passage as "Maslama heightened the four corners of the Friday Mosque". Such an interpretation would find further support in the literary accounts dealing with the construction of the Damascus mosque.

The key point to bear in mind in a discussion of the Damascus minarets is that there is no evidence that they were the work of any early Muslim patron. Indeed, the geographer Ibn al-Faḳīh, writing at the opening of the 10th century A.D., states specifically that the minarets (*mi'adhana*) in the Damascus mosque "were originally watch towers in the Greek days, and belonged to the Church of John. When al-Walīd turned the whole area into a mosque, he left these in their old condition". Similarly, al-Mas'ūdī writes that in this rebuilding "the *ṣawāmi'* were not changed, they serve for the *adhān* at the present day". Thus strictly speaking, there is no clear evidence even that these pre-Islamic towers were used for the call to prayer in Umayyad times, and one may especially doubt that they served this function before the reign of al-Walīd, when the Muslims shared the site of the future Great Mosque with the Christians. Nevertheless, the significant use of the word *ṣawāmi'* by the 'Irākī al-Mas'ūdī pinpoints the connection between Damascus and Fuṣṭāṭ, a connection which would make sense anyway because Damascus was Mu'āwiya's capital. Conversely, one might justifiably use the evidence of Fuṣṭāṭ to conclude that in all probability the corner towers at Damascus were indeed used for the *adhān* after the mosque had been built.

Reasonable grounds therefore exist for assuming that the corners of the mosque of 'Amr at Fuṣṭāṭ looked very like those of the Damascus *temenos*. Such *ṣawāmi'* could be no more than abrupt excrescences at roof level, possibly articulated a little further by crenellations. They would indeed resemble Christian towers, but only in a somewhat stunted fashion. They could not aspire to dominate the skyline or indeed make any marked physical impact on the urban landscape. If this motive had loomed large in the mind of al-Walīd at the time that he was building the Damascus mosque, it would have been a simple process to heighten the existing corner towers accordingly. That he chose not to do so is clear evidence that the symbolic role of the minaret was not yet generally accepted. Indeed, the mosques of Baṣra and Fuṣṭāṭ are more prophetic of later developments, even though they were built earlier. At Baṣra, the minaret, whatever its form may have been, was clearly distinguished by its different material of construction, while at Fuṣṭāṭ the *ṣawāmi'* were solid up to roof level, necessitating access by ladders. While this detail reflects the early Islamic practice of delivering the *adhān* from the roof, it is also conceivable that such corner *ṣawāmi'* had an architectural function as buttresses for the whole building. Their location and strength in turn invites a symbolic interpretation of their function as cornerstones of the faith. The impact of their placing can be gauged from the statement of al-Maḳrīzī that, at the time of the dawn prayer, a muezzin was stationed at each *ṣawma'a* and that their combined *adhān* resounded like thunder through the silent city. It might fairly be said, then, that despite the probably rather truncated nature of their resemblance to Christian towers, the *ṣawāmi'* of the Mosque of 'Amr did operate as markers of the mosque. This function was certainly performed more

effectively and elegantly by later minarets, but the crucial point is that it is already implicit in the earliest buildings of this genre.

As evidence of the relationship between the Christian towers of Syria and the early minaret, the earliest surviving Islamic monument, at Boṣrā [q.v.] in southern Syria, is often cited and certainly its minaret fits naturally into a long series of similar towers erected in pre-Islamic times as part of Christian churches, monasteries and houses, often with a defensive function. Yet, this Boṣrā minaret, notable for its bold projection from the otherwise regular perimeter wall of the mosque, a feature not explicable by e.g. any peculiarity of the site or structural consideration, is actually Mamlūk. The Umayyad *miḥrāb*, according to recent research by Jonathan Bloom, is the staircase minaret along the west wall.

Hence already in the first Islamic century, the religious role of the minaret had been defined in essentials; later times were to bring refinements, but after this first century, the development of the minaret proceeded rather on the lines of variations in form and new secular functions.

For some time, the square form, already well established in Syria, continued to dominate in the Islamic world. Recent excavations have confirmed that the square substructure of the minaret of the Mosque of Sīdī ‘Uḡba at al-Ḳayrawān in Tunisia is of Aghlabid date though some of the upper parts are later (thus weakening a once-popular theory that this minaret reflects the influences of the Pharos of Alexandria, which had a three-tier elevation, each tier smaller than the previous one), but it is quite possible that in its original form the minaret looked much as it does now. Lézine suggested that the lighthouse at Salakta was the formal model, but it is also possible that the Arab conquerors of North Africa, coming westwards as they did from Egypt, should have used the most celebrated tower of Egypt as a model for the minaret of the first mosque built in the newly-Islamised territory. In this mosque of al-Ḳayrawān, the minaret was placed opposite the *muṣallā*, and it was only a matter of time before the last refinement was added and the minaret aligned exactly with the *miḥrāb* [q.v.] (the Great Mosque at Sāmarrā is the earliest and best surviving example of this culminatory process). The substantial enclosed space of the al-Ḳayrawān minaret (base ca. 10m. square and height ca. 35m.) encouraged the possibility of provision of chambers within the minaret. For some reason, this was not done there, hence the minaret has inordinately thick walls; but later Maghribī and Andalusian minarets, such as the Almohad examples in Seville, Rabat and Marrakesh, employed such chambers and also gave them decorative vaults in stone or brick.

These three minarets of the later 6th/12th century mark the zenith of this genre in Western Islam, perpetuating the outer shell of pre-Islamic and early Islamic Syrian towers, and of the minaret at Cordoba, but they are much larger than their distant Syrian models (approaching 65m. in height) and display rich decoration on all four sides, with cusped, horseshoe or multifoil arches, often generating a lattice-work design, and also with single or paired windows on each storey. Eventually, too, the Andalusian minarets were to exert an influence on the campaniles of Spanish churches of the period—the wheel coming full circle, as it were, after these towers’ Syrian Christian origins. So strong was the tradition of the tall, square-shafted minaret in the Maghrib, that in the eastern Maghrib it survived the coming of the Ottomans; and in Ottoman Tunis, a novel type of octagonal minaret,

with each face richly tiled and the whole crowned by a projecting balcony and steepled pavilion, enjoyed special popularity.

An unexpected and distant by-product of the Syrian tradition is the Saharan or West African minaret. The Saharan type, often very high (e.g. the fairly recent example of the Walad Djalal at Zibane) has a marked batter to its walls—a feature which had occurred at al-Ḳayrawān but had not been exploited subsequently in the mediaeval period—and is crowned by an open-plan kiosk. In West African minarets, most of which date from the last four centuries (e.g. Timbuktu and Agadès), the latter is so pronounced that the minaret resembles a truncated cone, studded with projecting palm beams. These facilitate the constant repairs that such mud-brick structures require. Similar minarets are found as far north as the Mzāb region in Algeria.

The minarets of the Maghrib and Andalusia form a school unique in the Islamic world for its fidelity to an imported model and for its innate conservatism, which maintained a broadly consistent form throughout a vast area for over a millennium. The history of the minaret in the rest of the Islamic world, sc. in Egypt and Turkey and in the area to the east of them, is somewhat more varied. It embraces a very wide range of forms, of alien influences, and of functions both secular and religious.

This wider canvas is immediately apparent in the immediately post-Umayyad minarets which survive in the eastern Islamic world. These are principally to be found in ‘Irāk. Possibly the earliest among them is the so-called Manārat al-Muḏjīda, which departs from the norms of the first century by being a slender cylindrical structure of baked brick, with a winding interior stair and sparing external decoration in baked brick; hence it is prophetic of the minarets erected in Iran during the Salḡūḡ period. Moreover, it is entirely freestanding, with no sign of there ever having been a building adjoining it. It lay strategically on the route between the ‘Abbāsīd princely palace of al-Uḡhayḏīr [see ARCHITECTURE and pl. XIV there] and Kūfa, hence may have had the function of a marker, with its peculiar form a reflection of watchtowers which apparently stood along the former Sāsānīd *limes* against the Arabs in ‘Irāk.

The most celebrated of early ‘Abbāsīd minarets are of course the helicoidal towers attached to the Great Mosque of Sāmarrā (234-7/848-52) and the mosque of Abū Dulaf (245-7/859-61) [see ARCHITECTURE and Pls. XVII-XVIII there]. Although their precise origin is a matter of dispute, the question of a classical or Christian source does not arise. Their forms are deeply rooted in ancient Near Eastern architecture. In both cases, a square base carries an external ramp which spirals upwards, at first gently but then with increasing steepness, around a solid central cylinder. In the case of the minaret at Sāmarrā (the *malwiyya*) the ramp ends after five complete revolutions at an arcaded kiosk. A similar aedicule probably crowned the minaret of the Abū Dulaf mosque after the ramp had completed four revolutions. The Sāmarrā minaret is therefore substantially larger, and with a height of 53m. is indeed one of the highest minarets in the Islamic world. As befits its importance, the minaret has a new and imposing location. It is placed some 30m. outside the mosque and is precisely on the axis of the *miḥrāb*. By this means, its integration with the mosque and its liturgical function in relationship to the rest of the building is adequately stressed, while its isolation is sufficiently marked for the minaret to invite attention as a separate structure. The practice of

placing the minaret on the *mihrab* axis was copied throughout the Islamic world.

There seem to be two possible origins for this bizarre helicoidal form for a minaret. Firstly, an Iranian one. There survives at Firuzabad in Fars, the first capital of the Sāsānids, a square-shafted tower with the remains of an external ramp winding round it (called a *tirbāl* by the Arabs), and this monument has been interpreted as a Zoroastrian one, which had a fire burning at its summit; and we have noted the Arabs' readiness to take over architectural forms sanctified by earlier faiths. Secondly, there is the ancient Mesopotamian form of the ziggurat or tower-temple. Whilst most of these had stepped elevations made up of superimposed squares of decreasing size, a few had a square base which carried a huge central cylinder encircled by a rising ramp; a four-storeyed building of this type has been excavated at Khorsābād [*q.v.*] in northern 'Irāk. To have adopted either of these types as a basis for minarets would have accorded with the anti-Syrian attitudes of the 'Abbāsids. In the event, however, the *malwiyya* form seems to have been too eccentric to serve satisfactorily as a minaret, and it remained virtually without progeny.

The sole important descendant of the 'Irāki *malwiyya*, specifically that of the Mosque of Abū Dulaf, was indeed the minaret of the mosque built by a servant of the 'Abbāsids in 'Irāk, Aḥmad b. Tūlūn, in Egypt (263-5/876-9) [see ARCHITECTURE and Pls. XXI-XXIV there]. Unfortunately, the present minaret is a reconstruction of the late 7th/13th early 8th/14th century, but earlier historians agree that its original form was spiral.

But these spiral minarets, though fascinating, represent a by-way in the history of the minaret. In the eastern Islamic world, the dominating tradition was henceforth to be that of Iran, where an entirely different form, that of the lofty, cylinder type, developed; this obviously owed nothing to Syria, but might well have owed something to the regions on Iran's northern and eastern fringes, sc. India, Central Asia and even China (E. Schroeder speculated that the pillar form is an immemorial symbol of "the axis of the universe, and the direct way to Heaven"). Even so, such fragmentary evidence as survives suggest that the very earliest Iranian minarets, e.g. at Dāmghān and Sirāf, followed the Umayyad square-towered form, but judging by the minaret of the Nāyin mosque, which has a square, ground-level format surmounted by an octagonal shaft merging into a tapering cylinder, this form was soon modified. The Nāyin minaret seems to be pre-Saldjūk, and the literary evidence confirms that, by the 4th/10th century, extremely tall minarets were a feature of Iranian towns.

The tally of surviving 5th/11th and 6th/12th century buildings in Iran shows that this was a time of unprecedented building activity, with mosques being, like *madrasas* [*q.v.*], expressions of official Saldjūk patronage often executed by their *amīrs* (as at e.g. the mosques of Kazwīn and Burudjird). These soaring Saldjūk minarets—often around 30m. high, with a pronounced taper which accentuates their height, internal stairways, and lavish external brick geometric or calligraphic decoration contrasting with the plainness of the mosque walls—are of such assurance and completeness in their form that a previous period of development must surely be postulated. Within this context of Saldjūk patronage, one notes that the rich decoration of such minarets testified to its patron's munificence. Moreover, as an architectural project it was substantially smaller in scope—despite its ostentation—than a mosque. This would obviously

recommend it to less wealthy patrons. That these minarets did not necessarily have a straightforward liturgical function is suggested by the case of 6th/12th century Iṣfahān. Given that it is only the Friday mosque that according to custom (not dogma) requires a minaret, it is remarkable to note that this city, one of the Saldjūk capitals of Iran, had over a score of minarets in this period. In nearly every case, the mosque for which the minaret was originally intended has vanished. It is tempting to speculate that these mosques were very much simpler and humbler structures which had earlier not had minarets. One may justifiably assume that some evidence besides the minarets themselves would have remained if these minarets had been built contemporaneously with their adjoining mosques as integrated building projects.

The case of the mausoleum traditionally associated with the Sāmānid Ismā'īl b. Aḥmad at Bukhārā shows that by ca. 900 A.D. the effectiveness of brick decoration as a mantle for a building, one of relatively small surface area and therefore cheap, had been discovered, and was now transposed to the minaret (overall brick decoration on contemporary tomb towers, with their much larger diameters, occurs only on smaller buildings of that genre). The cylindrical Iranian minaret generated a surprising variety of forms, mostly in the 6th/12th century, with variations in the proportion of the plinth, octagonal or square, and the cylindrical shaft; two or three tiers of tapering cylinders (e.g. at Ziyār near Iṣfahān and at Djam in Ghūr in central Afghanistan); staircases might revolve round a central column or be built into the thickness of the exterior wall and carried on small vaults. Paired minarets probably date from this period, as a means of lending extra importance to the entrance gate of a building (e.g. at Ardistān and Nakhčiwān), eventually to be brought into the mosque proper in order to flank the entrance to the *muṣallā*. There seems to have been no consistent practice governing the location of single minarets within the mosque. When the minaret was erected as an integral component of the mosque, provision was often made for it to be entered not at ground level but from the roof of the mosque. The otherwise puzzling existence of such doorways comparatively high up the shaft of minarets which are now free-standing are clear evidence that they were originally intended to be part of a mosque.

A few minarets of this period raise searching problems of function. Some are located along major routes or at the edge of the desert (Khusrawgird; Ziyār; Mīl-i Nādiri), which would lend support to the theory that they served, no doubt *inter alia*, as signposts. Since much caravan travel was by night, a lamp at the top of a minaret would allow the building to serve as a landlocked lighthouse. A chance literary reference establishes that in 581/1185 the practice of placing a lamp at the top of a minaret was sufficiently familiar in Khurāsān to occasion no comment. Perhaps the most enigmatic, as well as the most splendid, minaret of the period is that of Djam, with a height of ca. 60m. unprecedented among Iranian minarets, and its main lower shaft principally decorated by a whole Qur'anic sūra (XIX, *Maryam*) plus other, mainly historical, inscriptions, lauding the achievements of the Ghūrid sultan Ghīyath al-Dīn Muḥammad b. Sām [see GHŪRIDS]; clearly, there is a motive here of prestige and victoriousness, with the Qur'anic text perhaps emphasising the Islamic faith in a land which had not long emerged from paganism.

In later periods, the Iranian minaret never recovered the importance it had had under the Saldjūks, but even so, new uses and new types of

decoration were found for it. In Il-Khānid times, the device of paired minarets flanking an important *iwān* [*q.v.*]¹—usually the entrance to a building—was enthusiastically employed (Abarkūh, Aštardjān, Karābāghlar and two buildings in Iṣfahān). There was a new emphasis on lavishly-applied tilework, and this was a crucial factor in a change of emphasis, the deliberate highlighting of the lower stages of the minaret. Under the Timūrids, the separateness of the minaret was stressed by the technique of enveloping the shaft with a lozenge grid in brick whose interstices were each filled with a medallion of high-quality tilework (e.g. the minarets of the Masjd-i Shāh and the Mosque of Gawhar Shād, both in Mashhad). In Ṣafawid times, the topmost storey of the minaret was standardised in the form of a tapering shallow-domed cylinder which, like the rest of the minaret, was entirely sheathed in glazed tilework, with, occasionally, much of the shaft gilded (e.g. at the shrines of Ḳum and Mashhad). Under the Kādjārs, architects signalled the increasingly secular function of the minaret by using it to punctuate entrance portals to bazaars (Yazd), towns (Kazwīn, Simnān) and places (Tīhrān); minarets, formerly single or in pairs, now proliferated and became trivial.

The influence of the Saldjūk minaret is clearly discernable in Muslim India, carried thither by the Ghūrīds and their epigoni; see below, 2. India.

There remains to examine the architectural genre of the minaret in Egypt and Turkey, two areas where it enjoyed great popularity. Turkey has had a distinguished though shorter tradition of minaret construction than Egypt, beginning with the very numerous minarets erected by the Saldjūks of Rum, in which we find a use of paired portal minarets, of massive strength, all of brick in their upper sections, contrasting with the ashlar stone façades below, all of this showing their ultimate Iranian origins.

Rather more individual, perhaps, was the Anatolian interpretation of what had long been a standard device of Islamic architects, namely employing a single minaret as an integral part of a mosque deserving special attention in its own right. The novelty lay in reducing the surface area of the mosque and thereby giving the minaret much more prominence. Nowhere in the Islamic world is the familiar silhouette of a compact mosque with a low dome and cylindrical minaret encountered as regularly as in Turkey. This is a schema which has attained well-nigh symbolic status, and was in Anatolia extended to *madrasas* and *imārets*. Their sturdiness and their location at a corner of the building lends these minarets the air of a bastion, well exemplified in the 'Alā' al-Dīn mosques at Konya and Niğde or the Ulu Cami at Divriği (all 7th/13th century) and, in the following century or so, in the mosques of 'Īsā Bey at Selçuk 777/1375) or Ilyās Bey at Miletus (806/1404). Such buildings kept the tradition alive and ensured that it became canonical under the Ottomans from the time of their earliest buildings at Iznik (Yeşil Cami) and Bursa (Yeşil Cami and the Hüdavendigâr mosque among others). In the mature Ottoman masterpieces of Istanbul, two or more minarets are standard equipment for mosque complexes; but in the provinces the old tradition continued unchanged, as mosques in Elbistan, Diyarbakir, Gebze and elsewhere testify.

Although a variety of forms were used in pre-Ottoman Anatolia, these minarets give little hint of the unique role which the minaret was to play in Ottoman architecture, one which became largely fixed, with its slender and elegant form, like a sharpened pencil, after the capture of Istanbul. In the Ottoman

minaret, the main cylindrical shaft rises from a square or polygonal base and is punctuated by one, two or even three circular balconies carried on *muḳarnas* [*q.v.*] vaulting, the whole being capped by elongated conical roofs, sheathed in lead and ending in finials. Muezzins on each balcony would deliver the call to prayer in the form of a canon; and the acoustic impact of these many voices would of course be significantly intensified in a mosque with multiple minarets, the voices interweaving in different sonorities depending on the height and distance separating the muezzins. Whether such musical refinements were entirely audible is another matter.

Perhaps the most celebrated feature of Ottoman minarets was not their outward form but their use in pairs, quartets or sextets as a device to proclaim the royal status of the building—for it seems that only a reigning sultan could erect more than one minaret per mosque. There can be little doubt that these mosques represent the most sustained attempt in all of Islamic architecture to reconcile the divergent aims of royal and religious iconography. These gigantic, needle-sharp lances clustered protectively, like a guard of honour, around the royal dome, have a distinctly aggressive and ceremonial impact, largely dependent on their almost unprecedented proportions; the pair of minarets flanking the Süleymaniye dome are each some 70m. high. Such minarets function simultaneously to enrich the exterior silhouette of the mosque—in the case just cited, for instance, the outer minarets flanking the principal façade of the building are shorter than those flanking the dome. Thus a pyramidal effect is achieved which is still further emphasised by the choice of a sloping site. The gently rolling skyline of Istanbul, with its rural views, was ideally suited for this kind of display, and the political significance of the city as the Ottoman capital may partly have motivated this new use of the minaret as a component of urban design on a mammoth scale. Such minarets were also used in a more symbolic way as markers of the courtyard of the *muşallā*, or of the entire mosque, staking out the boundaries of the religious domain within a secular environment. Dome chamber and minaret alike thus acquire extra significance as symbols of the faith. This development was not new, but only in Ottoman architecture is it pursued with such singlemindedness. It is therefore entirely appropriate that these minarets should, like the domes over the *mihrāb*, also bear the emblem of the crescent, supported on a series of superposed orbs.

If conservatism is the hallmark of the Ottoman minaret, its counterpart in Egypt is above all varied. This variety is all the more remarkable because the Egyptian school is to all intents and purposes concentrated on the buildings of Cairo, though it is represented in some small measure in the provincial towns of Egypt and in the architecture of the Mamlūks in Syria and the Levant. Unfortunately, very few surviving pre-Mamlūk minarets have escaped extensive alternation. Moreover, the most important examples to fall within this category are not metropolitan work at all but are found in various provincial towns—Esna, Luxor, Aswan and nearby Shellal, all dating from the late 5th/11th century and already displaying the characteristic Egyptian division of the minaret into separately conceived superimposed tiers, though Hidjāzī influences are at work also.

Interesting as these minarets are stylistically, they are insignificant in comparison with the great corner towers marking the main façade of the Mosque of al-Hākīm in Cairo, built between 380/990 and 401/1010. With their massive—but later—embattled

square bases, whose taper, like that of an ancient Egyptian pylon, is so pronounced that it is almost a slope, they have all the appearance of bastions. That this military quality was to some degree present in the original layout is shown by the façade of the Mahdiyya mosque, built in Tunisia early in the previous century, which too had the corners of its main façade heavily emphasised by bastions which matched the main entrance of the mosque in projecting some 3m. from it and moreover projected a full 7m. from the lateral walls. In its original layout, the Hākim mosque maintained the consonance between corner projections and portal already established at Mahdiyya, though the projection was twice as marked. Very soon, however—by 401/1010—each minaret was enclosed by a huge salient some 17m. square which allotted it a revolutionary and portentous role. Finally, in 480/1087, Badr al-Djamālī enlarged the northern salient to gigantic proportions—some 25m. square. He thereby not only incorporated the principal façade of the mosque into the expanded fortifications of the city—a clear indication of the essentially military flavour of this mosque—but managed to make the minarets play a major part in this process without noticeable strain or incongruity.

Since the minarets of al-Hākim survive only in an altered state, it is not easy to see where they belong in the corpus of Egyptian minarets. This is all the more regrettable in view of the once-vigorous controversy over the role of the Pharos of Alexandria, which stood intact until it was partially ruined by an earthquake in 180/796-7, in the evolution of the Egyptian minaret. Pace Creswell, who argued against any connection between the two building types, it can scarcely be overlooked that the surviving Egyptian minarets which date before 1100 all attest a pronounced multipartite division of the elevation. Since this feature is absent alike in the Syrian, Iranian and Maghribī traditions (with two significant exceptions), some rationale for this unusual feature must be proposed, and a probability here seems to be the Pharos, with the Egyptian minarets as free variations on the Pharos theme. (One should note that the Pharos was repeatedly rebuilt by the Muslims until its final disappearance between the early 7th/13th and the mid-8th/14th century. Indeed, as Butler noted, the account of 'Abd al-Laṭīf indicates that in ca. 1200 the Pharos comprised successively square, octagonal and round storeys and was crowned by a lantern or small cupola. It may well be, therefore, that this semi-Islamic Pharos rather than the original building was the means of establishing the tradition of the multi-staged minaret in Egypt.)

But if the Pharos did, in one or other of its successive guises, exert some influence on early Egyptian minarets, this does not seem to have been continuous. In the early versions of certain towers, the emphasis was on a tall, square shaft of Syrian type, which may be very plain (mausolea of Abu 'l-Ghaḍanfar, 552/1157, and Fāṭima Khātūn) or richly decorated (minaret in *madrasa* of Sultan al-Nāṣir Muḥammad), with the so-called *mabkhara* (because it resembled the top of an incense burner), a two-storey octagonal pavilion, crowning it. Subsequently, the *mabkhara* was accorded more emphasis, and its interior divisions made more marked, with differing ground plans, octagonal and circular, and decorative patterns.

In later times, the principle persisted of altering the ratio of the component tiers. The main shaft was reduced to the point where it was lost in the surrounding walls of the mosque, leaving the visible part of the minaret as an octagonal shaft with a cylindrical

superstructure (minarets of Shaykhūn and Sarghat-mish, both mid-8th/14th century). The transitions between the tiers were often marked by multiple balconies on *muḥarnas* corbelling, recalling Ottoman minarets, and these were indeed used to secure the same antiphonal effects in the chanting of the *adhān* as in Turkey. There was an emphasis on absolute height, with the southeastern corner minaret of the Sultan Ḥasan mosque soaring to 90m., the tallest in Cairo. The *mabkhara* was now replaced by the *kulla*, so-called because of its resemblance to the upper half of the typical Egyptian water container, pear-shaped and with at least two bronze finials whose crescents are orientated towards the *kibla*. In the final decades of Mamlūk rule, the minaret is crowned by a pair of square-plan pavilions crowned by a cluster of *kullas* (funerary complex of Kānshūh al-Ghūrī).

Finally, the popularity of the minaret in Mamlūk architecture invites explanation. In the 8th/14th and 9th/15th centuries, the main building type in Cairo appears to have been the composite ensemble. Its constituent parts could vary from one ensemble to another, but their main functional elements were the mosque, *madrasa*, *khānqāh* and mausoleum. Similar complexes had already become popular in Saldjūk Anatolia. In Egypt, however, unlike Anatolia, the minaret was from the first regarded as an integral part of such complexes. Whether this was entirely for functional reasons may be doubted. In the dense urban fabric of Cairo, nothing could more appropriately designate such a complex from afar than a minaret; and in this sense, it could be regarded as a public affirmation of its patron's munificence. Their placing varied. Sometimes they were located at the two corners of the principal façade, or flanking a gateway (e.g. Bāb Zuwayla); these were traditional locations. But many of the locations were unusual or even unprecedented. The *madrasa* of al-Sāliḥ has a single minaret above the central porch of the façade, and the two minarets in the mosque of al-Nāṣir Muḥammad on the citadel are at the corner of the *kibla* wall and to one side of the main entrance. The latter location recurs in the funerary complex of Kā'it Bay. In this unpredictable positioning of the minaret, one may recognise similar concerns to those of Ottoman architects. Now the minaret was, it seems, valued less for its actual or symbolic religious function and more for its role as a marker or articulating feature, both within the complex to which it belonged and more broadly within the cityscape itself. Once again, then, the flexibility of the forms developed by Islamic architects asserted itself.

Bibliography: E. Doulié, *Les minarets et l'appel à la prière*, in *RAfr.*, xliii (1899), 339-49; H. Thiersch, *Pharos in Antike, Islam und Occident*, Leipzig and Berlin 1909; R. Hartmann, *Manāra*, in *Memnon*, iii, (1910), 220-2; idem, *Zum Thema: Minaret und Leuchtturm*, in *Isl.*, i (1910), 388-90; H. Lammens, *Phares, minarets, clochers et mosquées: leur origine, leur architecture*, in *Revue des Questions Historiques*, N.S. xlvii (1911), 5-27; F. Sarre and E. Herzfeld, *Archäologische Reise im Euphrat- und Tigrisgebiet*, Berlin 1911-20, 4 vols.; K. A. C. Creswell, *The evolution of the Minaret, with special reference to Egypt*, in *The Burlington Magazine*, xlviii (1926), 134-40, 252-8, 290-8; E. Diez, *Manāra*, in *EP*; M. B. Smith, *The Manārs of Isfahān*, in *Athār-e Irān*, i/2 (1936), 313-58; E. Schroeder, *The Iranian mosque form as a survival*, in *Proceedings of the Iran Society*, i (1936-8), 82-92; J. Schacht, *Ein archaischer Minaret-Typ in Ägypten und Anatolien*, in *Ars Islamica*, v (1938), 46-54; S. Hassid, *The Sultan's turrets, a study of the origin*

and evolution of the minaret in Cairo, Cairo 1939; J. Sourdel-Thomine, *Deux minarets d'époque seljoukide en Afghanistan*, in *Syria*, xxx (1952), 108-36; Creswell, *The Muslim architecture of Egypt*, i-ii, Oxford 1952-9; G. Marçais, *L'architecture musulmane d'Occident*, Paris 1954; Schacht, *Sur la diffusion des formes d'architecture religieuse musulmane à travers le Sahara*, in *Travaux de l'Institut de Recherches Sahariennes*, xi (1954), 11-27; idem, *Further notes on the staircase minaret*, in *Ars Orientalis*, iv (1961), 137-41; G. R. Moḥammad *The minaret and its relationship to the mosque in early Islam*, Ph.D. thesis, Univ. of Edinburgh 1964, 2 vols., unpubl.; Creswell *Early Muslim architecture*², i/1, Oxford 1969, 59-61; D. Whitehouse, *Staircase minarets on the Persian Gulf, in Iran*, x (1972), 155-8; A. M. Hutt, *The development of the minaret in Iran under the Saljūqs*, M. Phil. thesis, Univ. of London 1974, 2 vols. unpubl.; F. Hernández Giménez, *El alminar de 'Abd al-Rahman III en el mezquita mayor de Córdoba. Genesis y repercusiones*, Granada 1975; Hutt, *The Central Asian origin of the eastern minaret form*, in *Asian Affairs*, N.S. viii/2 (1977), 157-62; J. M. Bloom, *The Mosque of al-Hakim in Cairo*, in *Muqarnas*, i (1983), 15-36; idem, *Five Fatimid minarets in Upper Egypt*, in *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians*, xliii/2 (1984), 162-7; B. O'Kane, *Saljūq minarets: some new data*, in *Annales Islamologiques*, xx (1984), 85-101, with full bibl. covering recent work on Saljūq minarets; D. Behrens-Abouseif, *The minarets of Cairo*, Cairo 1985; Bloom, *The minaret before the Saljūqs*, in *The art of the Saljūqs in Iran and Anatolia*, ed. R. Hillenbrand (in the press). (R. HILLENBRAND)

2. In India.

The *manāra* in India, commonly referred to by the *mīnāra* form *mīnār*, may be either (a) free-standing or (b) an integral part of a mosque or other building. In the second category, it is convenient to distinguish the (actually or potentially) functional from the non-functional forms. With rare exceptions, in some regional styles [see HIND. vii. Architecture] no form of the *mīnār* is used at all; D̲jawnpur; Mālwā; the Dihli sultanates and the pre-Mughal Panjāb; Sind; Kashmīr; the 'Imād Shāhī, Nizām Shāhī and Barid Shāhī sultanates in the Deccan. (It might be objected that the non-functional forms do not properly qualify to be called *mīnārs* at all; but these forms, with others to be mentioned below, are certainly derived from *mīnār* prototypes, and there is no other recognised term by which they may conveniently be described. The term *mīnār* is regularly applied to towers of many types and functions.)

(a) The free-standing *mīnār* first appears in India as an adjunct to the earliest mosque ("Ḳuwwat al-Islām") in Dihli, standing outside the original mosque compound, commenced by Ḳuṭb al-Dīn Aḳbak (whence, possibly, its sobriquet of "Ḳuṭb Mīnār" [q.v.]) about 595/1199, and completed before 634/1236 by Iltutmish [q.v.] to a height of some 230 feet. The taper of its profile is very pronounced, nearly 5° from the vertical and it was divided into four stages by encircling balconies supported by *mukarnas* corbels; the three lower stages show different designs of vertical fluting, the flutes on the lowest stage being alternately rounded and angular, those in the second all rounded, those in the third all angular (the original fourth stage was rebuilt into two storeys in 770/1368 under Firūz Shāh the Tughluqid). The occurrence of the Ḳur'ān, LXII, 9-10, in an inscription on the second storey affords presumptive evidence for the use of the *mīnār* as a *mīḏhana*. The assertions s.v. DIHLĪ (II, 260) and HIND (III, 441) above, that the fluted storeys

develop the polygonal outline of the *mīnārs* of Ghazna, taken as the prototype of the Dihli *mīnār*, now need modification in the light of later research: A. Hutt, in *Three minarets in the Kirman region*, in *JRAS* (1970), 172-80, shows that the section of the base of the minaret of the Masjīd-i D̲jāmi' of Zarand shows precisely the same disposition of alternate rounded and angular flutes; this is therefore a more exact exemplar for the Ḳuṭb Mīnār than the *mīnārs* at Ghazna, whose section is stellate, based on two interlaced squares. A *mīnār* in the Sīstān region, described by K. Fischer in *Afghanistan*, xxii/3-4 (1970), 91-107, of similar form, suggests a nearer prototype on the probable line of transmission to India. (There is thus now even less need to cite the form of the Doddabasappa temple in Dambal, Dharwar district, as a possible prototype of the Ḳuṭb Mīnār plan, as has been advocated by some Hindū enthusiasts.) The characteristic taper of the Kirmān examples, and of the minaret of D̲jām in Afghānistān, is also closer to that of the Ḳuṭb Mīnār than are the Ghazna examples. These details are emphasised here because of their persistence in certain aspects of mosque architecture, described under (b) below. Other free-standing *mīnārs* stand or stood at Kō'il ('Ālīgarh) (inscr. 652/1254; erected by Balban as governor to commemorate victories of the sultan Nāṣir al-Dīn Maḥmūd; tapering with square base and external galleries supported by cornices, with internal spiral stair, but demolished in 1862 without adequate record; Bayānā, cylindrical with slight entasis but unfinished, in city near Ukhā mandir and Ukhā masjīd, 9th/15th century, and tall *mīnār* in hilltop fort, tapered with corbelled balcony, inscr. 871/1466 (?), possibly with a double staircase (entrance blocked on my visit in 1972); Dawlatābād, "Ānd Mīnār" in inner city, ca. 849/1445, three encircling galleries supported by elaborate brackets, similar profile to *mīnārs* of *madrasa* in Bidar, see below; Bidar town, "Āwbāra", low cylindrical tower at crossing of main thoroughfares, early 9th/15th century; Ḳhotā Pandu'ā Bengal: massive *mīnār* 50m. from Baḳī masjīd, early 8th/14th century, five diminishing tiers resembling half-drawn-out telescope, lowest three fluted; Gawī: Fērōz Mīnār, ca. 895/1490, no taper, polygonal section. Both Hiran *mīnār* at Fathpur Sīkrī and "Nīm safā'ī" *mīnār* at old Māldā, Bengal, tapered with stone projections resembling elephant tusks (on which to display heads of rebels?), Mughal, late 10th/16th century; Dihli "Ār Mīnār", early 9th/15th century, many holes for same purpose; Shāykhūpūra, Panjāb, Hiran Mīnār, 30m., tapering 1044/1635, popularly sometimes supposed to commemorate D̲jahāngīr's favourite elephant, but often attributed to Dārā Shukōh. Finally, the Kōs Mīnārs of the early Mughal period, solid towers of similar profile to the Ḳuṭb Mīnār but only 6-8 m. high, were set at intervals of a *kōs* [see MIṢĀHA. 2. India] along the major thoroughfares. Many purposes are involved in the above: *mīḏhana*; observation post to command dead ground; possibly, following Hindū examples, "victory tower"; other commemoration; platform for shooting or observation game; execution displays; distance markers. The purposes are frequently combined.

(b) *Mīnārs* attached to a mosque or other building, however, are provided primarily as *mīḏhanas*, although since they are almost always multiplied symmetrically, they obviously have also an important aesthetic function (the single *mīnār* in the south-east corner of the courtyard of the Bahmanī Ēk mīnār kī masjīd at Rāyḥūr [q.v.] is a striking exception). Only in Guḍjarāt under the Aḥmad Shāhī

sultanate, and in Burhānpur in Khāndēsh, are paired functional *mīnārs* used regularly before the Mughal period; here they are cylindrical, their internal staircases opening on to one or more encircling balconies supported on heavy corbels as well as to the mosque roof, and are capped by conical roofs with no suggestion of an open turret. The earliest Aḥmad Shāhī examples flank the central arch of the *liwān*, although later they may be placed at the north and south ends of the façade. The latest mosques of the Aḥmad Shāhī period, e.g. Rānī Sabarī's mosque and the Īsānpur one, have solid pseudo-*mīnārs* at the ends of the façade.

This sudden reintroduction of the *miḏhana-mīnār*, with an immediate secondary aesthetic function, is not fully explained. Guḍjarāt mosques in Dihlī Sultanate times such as Hilāl Khān's one at Dhōlkā, the Džāmi' mosque at Cambay, have only solid conical or cylindrical pillars over the parapet flanking the central bay of the *liwān*; but earlier Dihlī Sultanate examples outside Guḍjarāt may show the connection with the Kuṭb Mīnār; e.g. the Afhā'ī dīn kā d̄jompfā mosque at Aḍmēr carries two cylindrical turrets, solid and some 2m. tall, over the *maḡṣūra* arch, with vertical flutes alternately circular and angular exactly as on the lowest storey of the Kuṭb Mīnār (similar fluting occurs on the external corner buttresses of the mosque courtyard). In Dihlī itself, the Kuṭb Mīnār profile is perpetuated in the solid buttresses which flank mosque gateways, the central bay of the *liwān* façade, the external *mīhrāb*-projection, and external corners of courtyards, in the Tughluḡ and Lōdī periods; these show at least one band of Kuṭb Mīnār-like fluting, and their profile is carried up above parapet level to end in a *guldasta*; especially when flanking the central propylon-like arch of the *liwān* façade, these suggest paired *miḏhana* towers, and may thus have a psychological purpose. This would seem to be the explanation for many of the examples which follow. In the Bahmanī Sultanate, the *mīnār* is not used regularly with mosques; that at Rāyčūr mentioned above is an exception, and the Čānd Mīnār at Dawlatābād is doubtless sited with the old Džāmi' mosque in mind although physically separated by some 100 metres—doubtless also to enable a view of broken ground to the east. The profile of both resembles that of the remaining one *mīnār* of two at the ends of the entrance façade of the *matrasa* of Maḥmūd Gāwān [q.v.] at Bidar, inscr. 877/1472, although the balconies of the latter are carried out from the main shaft in a curvilinear form rather than being supported on brackets in the usual Indian manner. All are crowned with a dome-shaped cap, with no open room at the top. The old brick *mīnārs* attached to the courtyard of the much later Makkā Masḡid at Bīdžāpur, also of Bahmanī date, have lost their upper parts; their balconies seem to have been supported on wooden brackets. Other Bahmanī *mīnārs*, all of similar profile, are the pairs flanking the gateways of the *dargāh* of Shaykh Sirādj al-Dīn Džunaydī and the so-called house of Gēsū Dārāz, both in Gulbargā, and those flanking both the outer and inner gateways of the *dargāh* at Aland; but these are crowned with foliated domes of three-quarter sphere shape, as in the 'Ādil Shāhī and Kuṭb Shāhī styles, and those of the outer gateway have moreover an encircling band of open arches in the Kuṭb Shāhī manner. Of possible relevance to the designs in north India referred to above are the *guldastas* which stand at the corners of the parapets of Bahmanī tombs, starting with the very earliest at Gulbargā: these are fluted, although fluting does not extend to the *mīnārs*. The *mīnār* proper is not used at all in the

Bahmanī's successor states. The skylines of mosques and tombs of the 'Ādil Shāhīs in Bīdžāpur and elsewhere are so liberally provided with vertical pillars as to resemble a burgeoning asparagus bed, but these are at best pseudo-*mīnārs* which may psychologically suggest the *miḏhana-mīnār* but whose real function is merely artistic. Turrets, *ḥatrīs* and *guldastas* are also freely used, but the relation between these forms cannot be pursued here. The *mīnār*-like structures of the Kuṭb Shāhīs of Ḥaydarābād and Golkondā, similarly, are usually solid shafts, cylindrical, with characteristic encircling arcaded galleries, although in a late offshoot of the Kuṭb Shāhī style in the Džāmi' mosque of Srīrangapattana [q.v.] ("Serīngapatam") an internal staircase is provided. That the bases of the pseudo-*mīnārs* of the Tōlī Masḡid (1082/1671) outside Ḥaydarābād city stand in pot-shaped bases should not be taken as representing any connexion with ancient Indian pillars.

Under the Mughals, the functional *mīnār* returns to north India; this is possibly inspired by Guḍjarāt examples, since other typically Guḍjarāt features are introduced into Mughal architecture after the conquest of Guḍjarāt in 980/1573. The first example is that of the four *mīnārs* at the corners of the gateway of Akbar's tomb at Sikandra, completed in the early years of the 11th/17th century: tapering, white marble (the lowest stage fluted), two intermediate balconies supported on corbel brackets, topped by an open *ḥatrī* with slender columns. With some variation in the patterns of the intermediate balconies, and of the material, section and decoration of the shaft, this type is the model for the major later *mīnārs*: at Džahāngīr's tomb in Lāhawr; the Džāmi' mosque (Shāhḡjahanābād) Dihlī; the Tādj Maḡall at Āgrā (but not the Džāmi' mosque); the mosque of Wazīr Khān at Lāhawr; the Bādshāhī mosque of Lāhawr, which has also short *mīnār*-like corner turrets; the tomb of Rābī 'a Dawrānī ("Bībī kā maḡbara") at Awrangābād; Awrangzīb's mosques in Banāras, Mathurā, etc.; short corner staircased *mīnārs* also at the tomb of I 'timād al-Dawla at Āgrā, little more than turrets, seem to be the model for engaged corner turrets at e.g. the tomb of Saḡdar Džang at Dihlī, and Mughal mosques in Bengal e.g. Dhakā, Murshīdābād, etc. Since there is no necessity for the *adhān* at tombs, many of these Mughal *mīnārs* are thus also principally decorative.

Bibliography: In addition to references in the text, see for the Kuṭb Mīnār, J. A. Page, *Historical memoir on the Qutb* (= *MASI*, 22), Calcutta 1926, and its abridgement *Guide to the Qutb, Delhi*, Calcutta 1927; cf. also A. Maricq and G. Wiet, *Le minaret de Djam*, Paris 1959. For Kō'īl: *Aligarh gazetteer*, 1902, 165 ff.; A. Rashid, *Koīl minar—who built?*, in *Proc. Ind. Hist. Congr.*, vi, 1943, 395-7 (not seen). For Bidar: G. Yazdani, *Bidar: its history and monuments*, Oxford 1947, 90-100 and Plates L-LVI, LXIV. For Bengal: short descriptions, photographs and bibliographical notes in Catherine B. Asher, *Inventory of key monuments*, in G. Michell (ed.), *The Islamic heritage of Bengal*, UNESCO Paris 1984, 53, 73, 108; for Čhofā, Panduā, also H. Blochmann, in *Proc. ASB* (1870), 122, and *JASB* (1870), plates. For Guḍjarāt, see *Bibl. to HIND*, vii. For the Bahmanī structures mentioned: illustrations in E.S. Merklinger, *Indian Islamic architecture: the Deccan 1347-1686*, Warminster 1981 (text very unreliable); for Rāyčūr also *Ann. Rep. Arch. Dept. Hyderabad*, 1339F. Illustrations of Kuṭb Shāhī (pseudo)-*mīnārs*: Čār Mīnār, *Ann. Rep. Arch. Dept. Hyderabad*, 1328F., 3-4, and Pl. III-IV; Tōlī masḡid, *ibid.*, 1326F., 3-5,