Encyclopædia Iranica

Article by **Mortaza Momayyez, Sheila S. Blair**

Published: December 15, 1995
Last Updated: August 20, 2015

DOORS AND DOOR FRAMES

DOORS AND DOOR FRAMES (*dar o sardar*), in Persian architecture major foci of decoration, varying in size and elaboration with the function and importance of the building and the location of the entrance in relation to the total composition.

i. FROM THE MEDIEVAL THROUGH THE SAFAVID PERIODS

Doors. In the Islamic period doors were usually made of wood, either large planks or joined pieces, and the finest examples were elaborately decorated. City gates were normally of huge sturdy planks with metal fittings, which were often the only parts to survive. The Ḥaẓīra gate at Yazd, for example, had iron plates decorated with figures, elephants, and a foundation inscription naming the amirs who funded the work in 432/1040-41; the city gate at Ganja (now Kirovabad) was inscribed with the names of the ruler and the *qāżī* (religious judge) who supervised the work in 455/1063 (Blair, 1992, nos. 41, 49). In both these inscriptions the smiths who made the fittings were named, and, as some of the earliest craftsmen to have signed their work, they must have been considered important artisans. City gates also had symbolic and apotropaic associations and were thus often removed by conquerors and reinstalled elsewhere as signs of sovereignty.

More elaborate doors were made of joined wood, sometimes inlaid with ivory and other precious materials and closed with bronze fittings inlaid with silver and gold. The standard arrangement comprised a pair of leaves, each with two vertical stiles connected by four or more rails enclosing three or more panels. The middle panel was often larger than the upper and lower ones. The pairs of doors still in situ at the shrine of Aḥmad Yasavī (799-801/1397-99) in the city of Turkestan, northwest of Tashkent, one at the main portal and another at the entrance to the mausoleum, exemplify the finest Timurid workmanship (cf. Lentz and Lowry, pp. 208-09; cf. pp. 46-49). Each wing reflects the traditional tripartite division into three rectangular panels: a larger vertical one sandwiched between smaller ones. The upper panels are inscribed, and the lower ones contain geometric medallions. The glory of the doors, however, is the superb carving of the central panels, with arched cartouches and arabesque tracery and palmettes on a delicate scrolled ground; the spandrels are filled with naturalistic vegetal tracery and peonies, other flowers, and leaves. These designs recall contemporary bookbindings and carpets and were based on the designs of court artists. A pair of doors made by the master carpenter Ḥasan (or Ḥosayn) b. Moḥammad in 846/1442 (Iran Bastan Museum, Tehran, no. 1135/3308; ht. 208 cm., w. 148 cm; *Arts of Islam*, no. 458) is evidence that the style was widespread.

The same arrangement of three rectangular panels continued on doors in the Safavid period, but the technique of decoration changed: The surfaces were painted with gold and polychrome pigments, then coated with resin varnish (see Plate XXXVII), a technique often erroneously identified as “lacquer.” Cartouches on the panels are decorated with figures adapted from book illustration (Plate XXXVIII). The paintings are executed in red, blue, green, and other colors against dark grounds that contrast with the gold brushstrokes in the surrounding field. The spandrels around the field are filled with arabesques, also on dark grounds. More elaborate examples, in which the fields around the cartouches are also painted with figural scenes, are probably 19th-century interpretations of Safavid work (Eastman).

Door frames. Doors were often the focus of elaborate surrounds of carved stucco or stone and framed by a flat masonry or brick structure known as a *pīšṭāq*. The *pīšṭāq* was already known at 8th-century palaces in Iraq and the ruined structure at Sarvestān in Fārs, of contemporary date but uncertain purpose (Bier, pp. 21, 50-51); by the 10th century elaborate portals with *pīšṭāq*s had been introduced in Persian mosques and mausolea. In the 9th century the

congregational mosque at Isfahan, rebuilt in the time of the ʿAbbasid caliph al-Moʿtaṣem (217-27/833-42), had had an articulated exterior facade, but the doorways were only slightly larger than the other blind arches and decorated with a gently arched motif (Galdieri). The Jorjīr mosque in Isfahan (late 10th century), on the other hand, has a projecting portal with intricate decoration, though the original height of the doorway is uncertain. The facade of the ʿArab-Atā mausoleum (367/978) at Tim near Samarqand (Figure 22) consists of an elaborately framed arch, but, as it occupies the entire facade of the building, it differs from the typical *pīšṭāq* of later times, which projects above a visible roof line.

By the 12th century most important buildings in Persia had portals projecting from and above the main facade. The elaboration of the doorway complemented the development of the four-*ayvān* plan, in which the tall axial *ayvān* preceded the dome chamber and the *pīšṭāq* matched it in height and general form. The entrance to Rebāṭ-e Malek, a caravansary/residence in the steppe between Bukhara and Samarqand rebuilt in 471/1078-79, is preceded by a pointed semidome, framed in a wide band of eight-pointed stars in relief (Plate XXXIX). At Rebāṭ-e Šaraf, between Mašhad and Saraḵs (508/1114-15; Godard, fig. 3), the portal is heavily decorated in relief brickwork. The trio of 12th-century mausoleums built by the Qarakhanids at Ūzgand in the Farḡāna valley (Hill and Grabar, figs. 112-19; Ettinghausen and Grabar, pl. 302) have squarish, shallow *pīšṭāq*s that mask the tomb chambers behind them. The portal added to one corner of the congregational mosque at Herat in Afghanistan in 596/1200 (Melikian-Chirvani, pls. VII-VIII) is embellished with an inscription in “knotted Kufic” script (see CALLIGRAPHY) highlighted in light-blue tile.

From the 13th through the 17th centuries the *pīšṭāq*, usually centered on the main facade, became proportionately taller and larger, as did the interior *ayvān*s to which it corresponded formally. The standard design, nascent in the 10th century, was canonized: The entry bay comprised a relatively small doorway below a tall, deep vault enclosing a pointed semidome, frequently filled with *moqarnas* (oversailing courses of niche sections set at angles to one another). The flanks of this entry bay were filled with decorative panels, epigraphic bands, and modest niches; the frame of the arch was composed of tiers of flat niches and decorative and epigraphic bands running along three sides of the *pīšṭāq*. The bands contained the foundation inscription with the patron’s name and the date of construction or foundation, koranic quotations,

and sometimes excerpts from endowment deeds. Tile decoration was mandatory; early examples include the *ḵānaqāh* of ʿAbd-al-Ṣamad at Naṭanz (707/1307; Plate XL; cf. Wilber, pp. 133-34 no. 39, pls. 52-54) and the congregational mosque at Varāmīn (722/1322; Wilber, pp. 158-59 no. 64, pls. 129, 131; Blair, 1986, pp. 65-68, pls. 2, 145-56). By the 15th century the entire *pīšṭāq* was covered with tilework, as at the "Blue mosque" in Tabrīz (870/1465; Golombek and Wilber, I, pp. 407-09 no. 214, II, pls. 415-16). In a few instances, like the "mosque of Bībī Ḵānom" at Samarqand (801-08/1398-1405; Blair and Bloom, pl. 49), twin minarets flank or surmount the *pīšṭāq*. At the congregational mosque at Yazd (14th century) the *pīšṭāq* is twice as high as the facade to which it is attached (Golombek and Wilber, I, pp. 414-18 no. 221; *Survey of Persian Art*, pl. 439A-B; Blair and Bloom, pl. 17); the *pīšṭāq* could also occupy as much as half the main facade, as at the *madrasa* (religious school) built by Uluḡ Beg in Samarqand (820-23/1417-21; Golombek and Wilber, I, pp. 263-65 no. 30, II, pls. 88, 95). In the Shah mosque at Isfahan (1021-47/ 1612-38; *Survey of Persian Art*, pls. 463-64; Blair and Bloom, pls. 236, 238) the *pīšṭāq* had developed into an entry complex that reorients the visitor toward the *qebla* (direction of Mecca) and provides a transition from the public *maydān* (open square) to the more private court of the mosque.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Arts of Islam, London, 1976.

L. Bier, *Sarvistan. A Study in Early Iranian Architecture*, University Park, Pa., 1986.

S. S. Blair, *The Ilkhanid Shrine Complex at Natanz, Iran*, Cambridge, Mass., 1986.

Idem, *The Monumental Inscriptions from Early Islamic Iran and Transoxiana*, Leiden, 1992.

Idem and J. M. Bloom, *The Art and Architecture of Islam, 1250-1800*, New Haven, Conn., 1994.

A. C. Eastman, “Palace Doors from the Throne-Room of Shāh ʿAbbās,” *Bulletin of the Detroit Institute of Arts* 7, 1926, pp. 49-52.

R. Ettinghausen and O. Grabar, *The Art and Architecture of Islam. 600-1250*, Harmondsworth, U.K., 1987.

E. Galdieri, “The Masğid-i Ğuma Isfahan. An Architectural Facade of the 3rd Century H.,” *Art and Archaeology Research Papers* 6, December 1974, pp. 24-34.

A. Godard, “Khorāsān,” *AÚthār-è-Īrān* 4, 1949, pp. 7-68.

L. Golombek and D. Wilber, *The Timurid Architecture of Iran and Turan*, 2 vols, Princeton, N.J., 1988.

D. Hill and O. Grabar, *Islamic Architecture and Its Decoration*, Chicago, 1964.

T. W. Lentz and G. D. Lowry, *Timur and the Princely Vision. Persian Art and Culture in the Fifteenth Century*, Los Angeles, 1989.

A. S. Melikian-Chirvani, “Eastern Iranian Architecture à propos of the Ghūrid Parts of the Great Mosque of Harāt,” *BSOAS* 33, 1970, pp. 322-27.

G. A. Pugachenkova, *Mavzoley Arab-ata*, Tashkent, 1963.

D. N. Wilber, *The Architecture of Islamic Iran. The Il Khānid Period*, Princeton, N.J., 1955.

(SHEILA BLAIR)
[Plate numbers in this entry have been corrected; the numbers given in the print edition’s version of the entry are in error.]

ii. IN THE QAJAR AND PAHLAVI PERIODS

In the Qajar period the designs and methods of construction of doors and door frames continued those from preceding periods.

Doors. Doors were generally made of wood from plane and mulberry trees but also from semihard forest woods like beech, maple, alder, elm, and walnut (personal communications from members of the carpenter’s guild, Tehran).

Whether large or small, traditional doors were constructed to revolve on the outer stiles, which were extended to fit into sockets in the lintels and sills; more recently they have been attached to door frames by means of metal hinges (Wulff, *Crafts*, p. 86). Large double doors, more than twice the size of ordinary house doors, were used for the portals of citadels, city gates, and entrances to mosques, caravanseries, *bāzār*s (Gluck and Gluck, p. 368 and pls.), palaces, and other monumental buildings. Usually a smaller door, known as *ḡolāmrow* (page's passage), was set into one of the wings of the main door, to provide easy access, as the main portals remained closed for security reasons.

The simplest doors were decorated with rows of metal bosses (*gol-mīḵ*), strips, and knockers (Michell, p. 120 pls. 27-28; Plate XLI). The bosses, placed in double rows on the upper and lower sections of the door, helped to prevent the wooden panels from cracking. Door knockers (*kūba*) were often signed by the smiths. All doors were bolted from the inside with *kolūn*s (tumbler locks; Wulff, *Crafts*, pp. 67-69 figs. 99-101). The traditional lock for the exterior was the *čeft-e varza*, in which the solid end of a narrow metal strip (*čeft*) was fastened to the door, either directly or by means of a chain; a slit in the other end of the *čeft* fitted over a metal half-loop (*bast*) set into the lintel. A padlock then secured the two parts.

Doors of palaces, principal mosques, and places of pilgrimage were more elaborately decorated. In addition to being fitted with bosses and knockers, they were sometimes carved, inlaid, or plated with engraved metal panels or even sheets of precious metal (for examples from the Pahlavi Marmar palace in Tehran, see Gluck and Gluck, pp. 365 pl. upper right, lower left and right, 367 pl.). The standard composition of the door resembled those for carpets and bookbindings, with features like a central medallion, cartouches, and corner pieces. Openwork wooden screens set in carved wooden frames often served as doors at tombs and shrines (Gluck and Gluck, p. 157 pl.). The shapes of doors generally conformed to the shapes of the openings, for example, curved on top in an arched door frame; sometimes the arched tympanum of the door was filled with openwork in brick, wood, or metal (for openwork on courtyard doors [1367 Š./1968] at the Nāranjestān mansion, Shiraz, see Gluck and Gluck, pp. 389 pl., 390 pl. top).

House doors were made in similar shapes and materials, though on a scale closer to the average height of a man. The degree of sophistication and the lavishness of the decoration depended on the status and wealth of the owner. In some regions of Persia the decoration of residential doors reflected specific

foreign influences; for example, motifs in Ḵūzestān and the coastal area along the Persian Gulf recall African and Indian originals (see Michell, p. 120 pl. 27). The designs of late Qajar and early Pahlavi wooden doors also reflect European prototypes, usually mediated through Russia and Turkey. Traditional designs based on *gol-mīḵ* gave way to framing devices and diaper patterns (Plate XLII). During the same period it became fashionable to paint doors in flat colors, whereas previously they had been left in their natural wood colors and maintained by annual polishing with vegetal oils. Toward the end of the reign of Reżā Shah Pahlavī (1304-20 Š./1925-41) European art nouveau and art deco styles were adopted for doors in Persia; the results were largely devoid of artistic merit or character. As with door frames (see below), there was also a tendency under the Pahlavis to revive historic styles, particularly of the Achaemenid, Sasanian, and Safavid periods (Gluck and Gluck, pp. 365 pls. upper right, lower left, 383 pl.)

The doors of shops and other places of trade differed in being divided into several wooden panels, which slid back and forth independently in grooves on the upper and lower parts of the door frame. To lock these panels, a long metal rod with a slit at one end, like a *čeft*, was passed through metal rings and locked onto a *bast*. More recently these door panels have been vertically hinged, so that they fold back.

Doors of village houses, storage spaces, and stables have only single wings, simply decorated with wood and a few bosses. The *čeft-e varza* is the only locking device used on such doors.

Finally, doors in the interiors of buildings were also fashioned from wood, though more delicately than outer doors; they usually consisted of two wings, and their surfaces were articulated with framing elements. In some instances the upper frames were filled with colored glass; the tympanum above such a door might be filled with stained glass (Gluck and Gluck, p. 390 pl. top), including the image of a half-sun. In the homes of the wealthy interior doors were often lacquer-painted with floral, vegetal, and bird motifs. Even more luxurious were the interior doors of palaces and important shrines, where marquetry, encrustation with precious stones, and layering with sheets of precious metals were common (see, e.g., Gluck and Gluck, p. 367 pl.).

Door frames. The gateways of large monuments were composed of several parts: an outer gate, a transitional space known as *rewāq*, and the door itself, which opened to the interior of the building. The vaulted space of the *rewāq*

was often decorated with *moqarnas* (oversailing courses of niche sections set at angles to one another) of the same materials as those on the outer facade of the gateway (for a Europeanizing stucco version at the Hotel Shah ʿAbbās in Isfahan, 1346-47 Š./1967-68, see Gluck and Gluck, p. 387 pl. bottom left). In private houses the transitional space is usually a small octagon or portion of an octagon, hence its name *haštī* (or *keryās*). The ceiling of the *haštī* may be plain or decorated with *moqarnas*. The ceiling and walls are sometimes whitewashed, and there may be stone dados. Most *haštī*s are equipped with small benches providing the visitor with a place to rest while awaiting permission to enter the house. A vestibule with shallow recesses on the side walls is known as a *dargāh*. The materials and methods of construction and decoration of the *dargāh* are the same as for the *rewāq* and the *haštī*.

Door frames consist of two major parts, the jambs flanking the opening and the lintel or arch connecting them at the top. The latter was usually the main focus of decoration; the jambs were articulated with engaged columns, either full length, with base, shaft, and capital, or half length, with shaft and capital supported on a volute. The architectural and decorative compositions of Qajar and Pahlavi door frames can be divided into two major types. One is associated with large buildings, where the apex of the arched opening intersects the horizontal line of the rectangular frame, leaving two spandrels filled with decorative patterns in glazed tile, stucco, or brick, in addition to rectangular bands of varying widths that border the frame. The second is characterized by a larger decorative surface above the opening, usually patterned in brick; this decoration is often quite elaborate, with an inscription on the lintel and a tympanum resting on two full columns, or it may be confined to an inscription band framing the doorway. The decoration of columns and lintels ranged from traditional types, as in the door frames of mosques, to those derived from Achaemenid and Sasanian prototypes or the European baroque (Plate XLIII, Plate XLIV).

Door frames were mainly built of bricks and surfaced with plain, molded, or carved bricks, often combined in patterns. Glazed tiles, stucco, stone, and occasionally unbaked bricks could also be used in the decoration of door frames, depending on the function and importance of the building. Glazed tiles in vegetal or geometric patterns appeared on religious buildings, whereas in secular buildings they might also include human and animal figures. By the middle of the Qajar period traditional designs were being combined with imported Victorian motifs, including human, animal, and landscape subjects.

Expensive stone was rarely used in the decoration of door frames but was reserved for palaces or state buildings; one extant example is the stone door frame at the Marmar palace. Stucco decoration is often relegated to the interior faces of door and window frames. Unbaked brick is still found on the door frames of village houses.

The decorative motifs found on door frames were mainly derived from the repertoire of Persian chinoiserie and arabesques. Single units of plain brick and glazed tiles were employed to form intricate and beautiful geometric patterns (for the Qajar Masjed-e Šāh at Qazvīn, see *EIr*. II, p. 628, pl. XVIII; cf. *Survey of Persian Art*, pl. 494A-B). The great variety of brickwork pattern elements used for door frames is apparent from the repertoire still common in Tehran (Figures 23-26; cf. Wulff, *Crafts*, p. 123 fig. 187). Among the simplest basic shapes (Figure 23) are *almāstarāš* or *lowzī* (lozenge shape); *hašt* (octagon); *naqš-e čašm-e gāvī* (lit., "cow's eye"; hexagon); *sellī* (a pentagon with two longer sides); *kīsa-ye sormadān* (lit., "case of the *sormadān*"; an elongated pentagon designed to fit between *sormadān* in patterns; see below); *pā bārīk* (kite-shaped element); *pā-bozī* (lit., "goat's foot"; a vertical rectangle with an elongated pointed top and a shallower point cut from the base); *setāra-ye īrānī* or *zohra-ye hašt par* (eight-pointed star); *bāzūband* (a cross with pointed ends, either symmetrical or with one longer arm); *gīva* (lit., "shoe"; shaped like a bow tie); *ālat-e čīnī-band-e rūmī* (a vertical bar bisected horizontally by a rectangle or an irregular pointed element); *sormadān* (one of several elongated shapes, with or without pointed ends, bisected horizontally by a rectangle or lozenge shape); *abābīl* (a three-pointed element with a flat base); *sormadān-e morabbaʿ* (lit., "*sormadān* with rectangle"); *sormadān-e lowzī* (lit., "*sormadān* with lozenge"); *čūb-ḵaṭṭ* (an angular tooth shape); *barg-e čenārī* (lit., "plane-tree leaf"; irregular leaf-shaped heptagon); and *šamsa-ye tah borīda* (seven radial points on a slightly angular base).

Molded and carved bricks (Figure 24) include *gūš-gorgī* (raised triangle on a vertical rectangular base); *ḥāšīa-ye gūy-nešān* (raised disk on a square base, intended for borders); *ḥāšīa* (semicylinder, also used for borders); *fetīla* (vertical rectangle with a semicylinder in relief); *šīār-qāšoqī* (lit., "spoon-shaped groove"; rectangular tile bisected by a semicylindrical groove); *nīm-gerd* (raised ellipse on a vertical rectangular base); *ṣalīb* (equilateral cross in relief on a square base); *setāra* (five-pointed star in relief on a square base); *ḥāšīa-ye tazyīn* (square base with a two-faceted top, designed to be set in groups of four); *morabbaʿ-e bāzūbandī* (square base with a raised section

resembling a smaller square with projections at the corners); *gol-e panj par* (five-petaled flower with raised center, the whole raised on a square base); *falsī* (lit., "scaled"; a horizontal rectangular base with two levels of overlapping scallops in relief); *ḥāšīa-moqarnas* (independent faceted element resting on a flat surface, with three exposed long sides tapering at each end to a point formed of three triangles); *ḥāšīa-ye bozorg* (tripartite fan shape raised on a square base); *ḥalazūnī* (lit., "snail shell"; curled half-palmette with volute in relief on a square base); *ḥāšīa-goldān* (vertical rectangle with "newel post" in relief); *ḵoršīdī-e kalla dar* (fluted fan in relief on a horizontal rectangular base); *pīčak* (lit., "ivy"; rectangular base with a volute in relief, intended to be set in alternating directions); *kelīdī* (lit., "key-shaped"; a vertical rectangular base with a relief design consisting of a semicylinder at the top interrupted by a circle in the center supported on two narrower semicylinders at the base); *zanjīra-yešāḵ o bargī* (vertical rectangular base with half-leaf supported on a volute in relief, meant to be laid in alternate directions to form a continuous frieze); *zanjīra* or *zanjīrī* (vertical rectangular base, with raised bands forming interlocking arrow shapes when laid in a frieze); *kākol* (lit., "crest"; vertical base tapering toward the top with relief plant consisting of successively smaller elements aligned vertically); *nīm-toranj* (plant in a vase standing on a two-stepped platform, all in relief on a square base); *tāj* (crown; elaborate floral form in relief on a square base); *naqš-e šīr* (lion's head in relief on a square base); *mowj* or *modāḵel* (element shaped like a *sormadān-e lowzī* placed horizontally, with raised border and molded composition of volutes in the center); and *sar-sotūn* (vertical rectangular base, with four courses of multifacted relief producing the effect of an engaged column capital).

More elaborate composite elements with relief (Figure 25) include *kalla-santūrī* (lit., "head of the musical instrument *santūr*"; gable-shaped tympanum with raised border); *kalla-santūrī-e šekasta* (like the preceding but with a semicircular gap replacing the upper point); *zānūī* (lit., "knee-shaped"; vertical rectangular base with raised border, broadened into a volute at the top of one side); and *sar-tāj* (tympanum with raised border of alternating curves and angles).

Among specific patterns in which these elements are combined (Figure 26) are *band-e ʿalamī* (bricks laid vertically); *naqš-e ḥaṣīrī* (basketweave); the basic form of *čandragī* (six horizontal bricks forming a cross); *rag čīn-e jenāḡī* (herringbone); *čandragī-e hāšīadār* (central *čandragī* element within larger frame of vertical bricks); a variant of *čandragī* in which a larger frame of

horizontal bricks surrounds a negative of the basic form); *ālat-e čīnī-band-e rūmī* (*sormadān* placed vertically); *ṣalīb* (staggered courses of octagons with inscribed crosses, separated by squares in each course); *ālat-e jaʿfarī-e čūḵaṭī* (a diaper pattern composed of eight-pointed stars and crosses); and *čahār langa-ye ḥāšīadār (*an interlocking design of relief with gabled profiles, the dark lines representing mortared joints).

Other terms include *vārū* (lit., "upside down"; fan-shaped?); *barg-e kangarī* (cardoon or artichoke leaf); *barg o morvārīd* (leaf and pearl); *toka* (arrow without point; cf. Wulff, *Crafts*, p. 123 fig. 187: an elongated triangle set on its short base); *jeqqa* (aigrette); *dom-kalāḡī* (lit., "crow's tail"); *rīša* (root?); *ṣadaf* or *gūšmāhī* (shells); *ḵofta wa rāsta* (various horizontal and vertical forms?); *čahār ḵāna* (grid); *dandān mūšī* (lit., "mouse teeth"; crenellated); *abrī* (cloud pattern); *band-e jaʿfarī* and *band-e rūmī* (types of diaper work).

(For cited works not found in this bibliography, see "Short References.") Ī. Afšār, *Yādgārhā-ye Yazd*, 3 vols., Tehran, 1348-54 Š./1969-75.

J. Gluck and S. H. Gluck, *A Survey of Persian Handicraft. A Pictorial Introduction to the Contemporary Folk Arts and Art Crafts of Modern Iran*, Tehran, 1977.

A.Ḥājj ʿAlī Moḥammadī, *Noqūš-e sardarhā-ye ḵānahā-ye Tehrān-e qadīm*, Tehran, 1372 Š./1993.

G. Michell, ed., *Architecture of the Islamic World. Its History and Social Meaning*, London, 1978.

Ḥ Solṭānzāda, *Fażāhā-ye worūdī-e ḵānahā-ye Tehrān-e qadīm*, Tehran, 1371 Š./1992.

P. Tanavoli and J. T. Wertime, *Locks from Iran. Pre-Islamic to Twentieth Century*, Washington, D.C., 1976.

(MORTAŻĀ MOMAYYEZ)

[Plate numbers in this entry have been corrected; the numbers given in the print edition's version of the entry are in error.]

Figure 22. Drawing, facade of the ʿArab-Atā mausoleum (367/978) at Tim, near Samarqand. After Pugachenkova.

Figure 23. Independent tile or brick elements. a. Almāstarāš. b. Hašt. c. Naqš-e čašm-e gāvī. d. Sellī. e. Kīsa-ye sormadān. f. Pā bārīk. g. Pābozī. h. Setāra-ye īrānī. i. Three types of bāzūband. j. Gīva. k. Two versions of ālat-e čīnī-band-e rūmī. l. Sormadān. m. Abābīl. n. Sormadān-e morabbaʿ, sormadān-e lowzī. o. Čūb-ḵaṭṭ. p. Barg-e čenārī. q. Šamsa-ye tah borīda.

Figure 24. Molded or carved elements. a. Gūš-gorgī. b. Ḥāšīa-ye gūy-nešān. c. Ḥāšīa. d. Fetīla. e. Šīār-qāšoqī. f. Nīm-gerd. g. Ṣalīb. h. Setāra. i. Ḥāšīa-ye tazʾīn. j. Morabbaʿ-e bāzūbandī. k. Gol-e panj par. l. Falsī. m. Ḥāšīa-moqarnas. n. Ḥāšīa-ye bozorg. o. Ḥalazūnī. p. Ḥāšīa-goldān. q. Ḵoršīdī-e kala dar. r. Pīčak. s. Kelīdī. t. Zanjīra-ye šāḵ o bargī. u. Zanjīra. v. Kākol. w. Nīm-toranj. x. Tāj. y. Naqš-e šīr. z. Mowj. aa. Sar-sotūn.

Figure 25. Composite relief elements. a. Kalla-santūrī. b. Kalla-santūrī-e šekasta. c. Zānūʾī. d. Sar-tāj.

Figure 26. Patterns composed from individual elements. a. Band-e ʿalamī. b. Naqš-e ḥaṣīrī. c. Čandragī. d. Ragčīn-e jenāḡī. e. Čandragī-e hāšīadār. f. Čandragī. g. Ālat-e čīnī-band-e rūmī. h. Ṣalīb. i. Ālat-e jaʿfarī-e čūḵaṭṭī. j. Čahār langa-ye ḥāšīadār.

Plate XXXVII. Applewood doors, painted, lacquered, and gilded, in the manner of Reżā ʿAbbāsī, Persia, 16th-17th centuries, City of Detroit Purchase 26.7. Courtesy
Detroit Institute of Arts.

Plate XXXVIII. Painted cartouche, detail of central medallion of right-hand wing of door shown in Plate XXVII. Courtesy Detroit Institute of Arts.

Plate XXXIX. Portal of Rebāṭ-e Malek, a caravansary/residence between Bukhara and Samarqand, rebuilt in 471/1078-79. After Survey of Persian Art, pl. 272.

Plate XL. Portal of the ḵānaqāh of ʿAbd-al-Ṣamad at Naṭanz (707/1307). Photograph S. Blair.

Plate XLI. Wooden house door of the period of Reżā Shah but in the Qajar tradition, with metal bosses and knockers, Tehran. Photograph M. Momayyez.

Plate XLII. Painted wooden house door in Tehran, of the period of Reżā Shah, reflecting European taste for shaped and recessed paneling and including a

mail slot.
After Solṭānzāda, p. 64 fig. 78.

Plate XLIII. Doorway in Tehran, period of Reżā Shah, combining jambs inspired by the Qajar tradition and a highly individual choice of various Western decorative el
ements. After Solṭānzāda, p. 55 fig. 59.

Plate XLIV. Doorway in Tehran, period of Reżā Shah, incorporating various elements of European inspiration. After Solṭānzāda, p. 59 fig. 67.