Abstract

Previous studies suggest that spatial analyzing and typology of non-religious specimens such as “Palace”-including a glorious space which has formed in order to satisfy royal aspirations- have been faced uncertainties because of its essence. According to the conclusions, the innovative movement of Iranian palace making has introduced the scheme of specific palaces with an octagon plan during Safavid dynasty, while historical documents have narrated that, the prior type of this palace has transmitted to other points of Iran and neighboring territories by forming during Turkman’s dynasty with capital of Tabriz.

The current study aims to clarify the architectural form of Tabriz’s Hasht-Behesht palace beside its direct influence on Iranian and foreign specimens by analyzing historical contexts. The result of this study shows that, the formation of Tabriz’s Hasht-Behesht palace is connected to compulsive immigration of craftsman and architects of Northwest Iran to Central Asia by Timor and experience of nomad’s lifestyle which by transition of capital to Tabriz, the type of Hasht-Behesht had been revealed and influenced Qazvin’s and Isfahan’s specimens during Safavid era. It sounds that, the geographical position of Azerbaijan beside ongoing political tensions with Ottoman empire was effective in distribution of Hasht-Beheshts form into Chinili kiosk palace. On the other hand, the presence of Indian envoys in Iran and their friendly relations with Safavid governments was pregnant in Hasht-Behesht form in Indian subcontinent. For example, Timur’s efforts in transferring many Iranian artists and architects, especially the architects of Azerbaijan to Samarkand (the capital city) and the use of their plans and architectural ideas around Samarkand leads to constructing many gardens and internal architectural spaces under the impact of Ilkhanid Mongols’ architecture. It seems that during the Timurid ruling, the renaissance of Iranian gardening, “kiosk” as a fixed element gradually replaces the existing palaces of the kings in that period. It seems that as times went and administrative, governmental, and recreational sections got integrated and by adding private usages to the complexes (Haramsara), destructable architectural elements (Sarapardeh) were replaced by resistent materials. From this view, Samarkand is a sample of garden cities during Islamic period in a way that there is a garden in the city in which a city with all facilities is located. In most cases, there is an architectural space or kiosk in the middle of the garden that was called palace, mansion, or garden depending on its application. These buildings, normally with a 4-section plan or cross-shaped plan were multi-storey with a view over the garden.
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Introduction
The evolutionary trend of the palace, this luxurious kingly space as an example of non-religious architecture, has always been controversial in studying Islamic architecture. It is a structure in which necessary requirements of resistance have not been considered despite other Islamic structures. So, the significant scarcity of Islamic palaces has created many problems on the way of studying and analyzing their architectural trends. In a way that except for the ruins of some Omavid, Abbasid, and Qaznavid palaces, there is nothing significant left from other palaces during other Islamic periods till Safavid era to get a good understanding about the evolutionary trends of Islamic palaces and their mutual effects on each other through these studies. Although the shortage of archeological remainings of Islamic palaces is a main concern for the experts of Islamic architecture, their negligence towards precious information in historical resources is a further reason for our insignificant information in this regard, overshadowing insufficient extant information and their analysis.

Based on the historical resources, the constructions in green spaces like garden paradise, flower house, and etc were always evident (Beyhaqi, 1983: 36; Aliyazdi, 1956: 215-571). Although based on Islamic trainings, focus on building luxurious complexes like palaces was not publicly desirable, first signs of garden and green space building in Iran during Islamic times belonged to Albavand in the northern Iran (Golombek, 2006: 142). In Aleboyeh era in southwestern Iran, some gardens and palaces were build in the rein of Azed-Al-Doleh (Khansari, et al, 2004: 56). Also, the custom of building garden in Gaznavid time continued by building gardens like Lashkaribazar, Piroozi, Adnani, Sepid, and etc. Among kiosks in the gardens mentioned by Beyhaqi History, SadhezarehKiosk, AbdolaliKiosk, DolaKiosk, LanjanKiosk, Shah Kiosk, AdnaniKiosk, MahmoodiKiosk, and MasoodiKiosk can be mentioned (Beyhaqi, 1984: 409). In Seljuks’ rein, garden-building in the plateau of Iran had a significant spread. One of their important achievements is building Karan garden in Isfahan (Mafrokhi, 2006: 49-54; Honarfar, 1955: 56-57). During Ilkhanidera, Gazan Khan planned and changed the applications of around-city gardens and built charity buildings (Fazlolah Hamadani, 1954: 998; Oliachalabi, 1958: 54). Timur’s efforts in transferring many Iranian artists and architects, especially the architects of Azerbaijan to Samarkand (the capital city) and the use of their plans and architectural ideas around Samarkand leads to constructing many gardens and internal architectural spaces under the impact of Ilkhanid Mongols’ architecture (Petrochioli, 2012: 283-284; Golombek, 2006: 142). It seems that during the Timurid ruling, the renaissance of Iranian gardening, “kiosk” as a fixed element gradually replaces the existing palaces of the kings in that period (Okane, 1998: 249-255).

Although with the transfer of power to the Torkmans, Tabriz introduced a particular style of palace-building, including a plan in 8 sections that was unrivalled till that period (Okane, 1998; 230-250; Blair & Bloom, 2012: 95-107; Helenbrand, 2014: 376-407; Kentarini & Alsandri, 2003: 410-425 and Bedelisi, 1995: 60-89). However, most experts of architectural history have attributed the innovation and the origin of the so-called HashtBehesht (i.e. 8 paradises in Persian) palaces to the Safavid era. This study takes the first steps to fill the gap in the architectural history of Iran and its neighboring lands, especially in the field of building palaces.

Background
Valuable researches of Wilber and Golombek are among the most comprehensive interpretations of history, formation, and architecture of Iranian and Turanian palaces for describing and discussing the architectural revolutions of these palaces. This is despite the fact that none of them has pointed to the architectural and appearance analysis of HashtBehesht palace in Tabriz and have just offered the recent descriptions in this regard (Wilber and Golombek, 1988: 248-250; Wilber, 2011: 10-96).

Also in the Islamic art and architecture, Blair & Bloom
describe some Islamic palaces including an eight-dimensional palace in Ilkhanid era and Hasht Behesht palace in Qazvin and Isfahan (Blair & Bloom, 2012: 90-107). Although the researches of Helenbrand is worthwhile in this field (Helenbrand, 2014: 377-460), the trend of forming the first prototype of Hasht Behesht and the way of interaction of its spatial structures with its successor structures was not studied. In relation to internal studies, surveys on Hasht Behesht palace are restricted to the geographical location of the oldest existing monument in Tabriz, not giving an elaborate analysis of its plan and spatial structure (Bedelisi, 1999: 26; Omrani and Aminian: 2007: 2-20). Also, general references and spatial studies of urban structure and the location of Hasht Behesht in Tabriz have duplicated this difficulty (Hanachi and Nezhadebrahimi, 2006: 3-19).

**Timur gardens in Samarkand and its surroundings**

Timur was a descendant of the nomads who spent some decades of his life to glorify his capital Samarkand and made a belt of gardens, putting the name of Islamic popular cities such as “Cairo”, “Damascus”, “Baghdad “, “Soltanieh “and” Shiraz “on them. These gardens surrounded Samarkand like a ring2 (Wilber, 2011: 57. Golombek, 2006: 140, and Jackson and Lockhart, 2011: 119). Clavijowho was in Samarkand in 807A. H. provided excellent descriptions about Timur’s tents. In that time, dominant architectural pattern in the society included a silk awning, seen in many miniatures of that time. Timur’s mansion that was like a real palace with very beautiful colors was sown with different strings. The most glorious ornaments were in the dome. In four corners of that the images of an eagle with open wings were drawn (Zangeryet, 2012: 196 ; Clavijo, 1995: 229). It seems that as times went and administrative, governmental, and recreational sections got integrated and by adding private usages to the complexes (Haramsara), destructable architectural elements (Sarapardeh) were replaced by resistant materials (Okane, 2006: 49-55). From this view, Samarqand is a sample of garden cities during Islamic period in a way that there is a garden in the city in which a city with all facilities is located (Wilber, 2011: 57). In most cases, there is an architectural space or summer house in the middle of the garden that was called palace, mansion, or garden depending on its application. These buildings, normally with a 4-section plan or cross-shaped plan were multi-storey with a view over the garden. Its mansion was built across from a large pool and stream, decorated with paintings, glazed tiles, and other artistic pieces (Petruecioli, 2012: 278). A kiosk in the simplest form can be a platform with railing under a tree, frequently seen in the miniatures of this period (Table 1).

**Sahebabad square and garden, Turkmen government’s center in Tabriz**

After the the collapse of the successors of Timur Shah in Harat and GaragoyonlooTurkmens’seizing power, by transferring political center to Tabriz and settlement of many Timor’s architects and artists to his capital “Jahanshah” founded a certain style of architecture in Tabriz. In that time, SahebabadSquare was considered as the government center; although by Aghghoyonloorsers seizing power (780-908A.H.).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sefid Garden, Plane Square</th>
<th>Rose Garden</th>
<th>Dolatabad Garden</th>
<th>Now Garden</th>
<th>Shomal Garden</th>
<th>Delgosha Garden</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Table 1. Spatial structure of Timur’s gardens in Samarkand, emphasizing building a kiosk in the garden’s center. Source: authors.
and selecting Tabriz as the capital, Sahebabad square and garden were considered more than before. In a way that by developing this place by the leader of Aghghoyonloos (Ozoonhasan), this complex was selected as the ruling center of Aghghoyonloo rulers (BaniMasood, 2004: 4). The complex of Sahebabad square and garden was formed as the location for the settlement of Hashtbehesht Palace in a definite period with a preplanned sketch based on specific social-political conditions (Ibid).

By continuing and developing construction activities around Sahebabad Square, Ozoonhasan created multiple functioning for this square. Also, proper climate and increasing economic-political interactions created and developed many administrative and governmental sections around Sahebabad Square, adding recreational and amusement functions to it. Based on the documents, built mansions around this square included Hashtbehesht Palace Nasrieh Complex of Ozoonhasan whose son founded, consisting of a mosque, a school, a restaurant for the poor and a hospital. Also, the palace was connected to a square, mosque, or a hospital (Blair & Bloom, 2012: 105).

Many of these works were ruined for the destructive earthquakes or foreign invasions like Ottoman attacks and there is nothing left of them (Hasanzadeh, 1999: 118) (Fig. 1).

Eight from the view of Islam

Venetian businessman describes Hashtbehesht Palace: “This palace is called Hashtbehesht in Persian. But in our language it means eight sections since it is made of eight parts (Kentarini & Alsandi, 2003: 414). From Muslims’ view, there are seven hells and seven heavens since God’s mercy has preceded his wrath. Dividing gardens into four or eight sections which is common in Muslim India and Iran is a reflection of this belief since Koran has promised the gardens under which there are streams. In this way, a HashtBehesht garden can be a symbol of heavenly happiness (Shimel, 2012: 171-172). This garden probably surrounded an architectural space. Thus, in Islamic art and architecture, number eight refers to eight angels that will carry divinity throne in doomsday. Thus, described HashtBehesht in Koran has eight corners based on which eight doors have been considered for them. The name of HashtBehesht or eight doors of heaven for this architectural space reflect these concepts (Taghvaei, 2011: 151). Also, from the view of an Islamic rationale, eight dimensions of a kiosk reflects the divine throne that is placed on the shoulders of eight angels based on the Islamic narrations (Toosi & Emamifar, 2011: 70). Perhaps, for this reason, such kiosks were built on the platforms in the middle of a lake or pond since such
a plan was a sample of reaching heavenly happiness (Schimmel, 2007: 353).

**Describing architecture of HashtBehesht based on historical resources**

The most reliable resource that describes the complex of HashtBehesht in detail is the itinerary of Venetian businessman. In a part of his itinerary, he describes HashtBehesht complex: “Hasanbeig Palace is so glorious that has been unprecedented in Iran. The palace was built in the center of a big and beautiful garden near city that only a stream in the north separates the palace and city” (Kentarini & Alsandri, 2003: 414). Referring to the miniature of Metraghchi and the location of HashtBehesht complex in Sahebabad garden and its square, it is seen that the complex of HashtBehesht garden and palace are located in the suburb after urbanization revolutions in Turkmans’ rein (Omrani and Aminian, 2007: 2-13 ; Hanachi and NezhadEbrahimi, 2006: 4-21). This unanimous Venetian businessman adds: “Its height is 30 steps and its area is 70-80 yard, divided into 8 sections and each section has 4 rooms and 4 waiting rooms” (Kentarini & Alsandri, 2003: 414). The supposition of Masood is that by the height he means the mansion’s length not its height. Because it doesn’t seem rational that the tourist identifies the height by step. In similar cases everywhere in the itinerary he uses step for measuring the length in the sizes of the constructions (Bani Masood, 2005: 7). Based on the estimations, every yard equals 9.144 m (Amid, 1886, below yard). Then, the perimeter of the kiosk in HashtBehesht is seventy yards (64.008m) or eighty yards (73.152m). The Venetian businessman also suggests that the palace is built in the centre of a garden on a platform whose height is 1.5 yard (1.37m) and its width is 5 yard (4.75). Across from each door, there is a marble path that leads to the platform. In front of the main door of the palace there is a small stairway built of the best marbles by which individuals reach the platform. 3 yard (2.743) above the platform was built by top marbles. This view is very showy from a far distance like a mirror (Kentarini & Alsandri, 2003: 415); (Fig.2).

In the constructions of northwestern Iran, for the high level of ground waters in Azerbaijan, building on the stone plinth is necessary (Mousavi, 2011: 124). Therefore, in order to solve moisture ascention and freezing problems using stone in the layers attached to the ground seemed necessary. In this regard, based on Venetian descriptions, Hasht-Behesht was placed on a stone platform whose connection to the rest of the building was through a stone plinth.

**A review of the dome’s cover and architecture in HashtBehesht palace**

The Venetian businessman adds: “The rest of the palace includes a circle and beautiful dome” (Kentarini & Alsandri, 2003: 414). Differentiating between different sections inside the palace, he describes the dome parts a space separate from eight sections, calling it the rest of the palace. The point that should be mentioned about dome architecture in HashtBehesht is the way of access to the dome. It is worth mentioning that regarding the applications of bay system in many Ilkhanid constructions, it becomes more common in eighth century A. H.. Considering many constructions of this period such as Miremad Mosque of Kashan and Blue Mosque of Tabriz (Asar, 1990: 54) and remaining miniatures from Turkmans (Ajand, 2013: 475), the authors believe that in the architecture of HashtBehesht, access from Geriv to the dome has been through bay system. The important point here is the similarities of
HashtBehesht dome (besides Gooramir Dome in Samarkand) with miniature dome of Turkmans because the most similar to HashtBehesht dome is two layer dome built on the high of Turkmans whose outside is decorated with a shining onion-shaped and blue dome. The dome was on built on a long stalk showing the height and grandeur and the coordination of internal spaces (Blair & Bloom, 2012: 92-97).

This is while many Timurid tombs and constructions, especially the Shahzand Tomb in Samarkand has the same style of bay system (Wilber, et al, 1995: 120-157). This style of covering Timurid constructions was performed in Blue Mosque of Tabriz (Atigh dome over Geriv) although the main dome of this mosque was ruined after different earthquakes and the present dome is an incorrect reconstruction of the previous dome (Zoka, 1988: 185). At the end, it seems that HashtBehesht palace that had two hollow layers over a high Geriv, built on anoctagon plan like other constructions of its era (Wilber, et al, 1995: 120-157; Blair & Bloom, 2012: 92-97) followed other constructions of Timurid era with two-layer domes over a high Geriv. This is a technique that preserved aesthetic aspects of the building besides preventing from the pressures on the arches and walls (Fig. 3).

Fig. 3. On the right, schematic elements of the porter in HashtBehesht and their locations, red “high rise of panj o haft arch‘’, entrance gate, yellow, the same arch on the first floor, orange, the same arch on the second floor. Source: authors. On the left, the plan of access to different spaces of HashtBehesht in Tabriz. Source: authors.

Recognizing alternative functions of HashtBehesht in Tabriz
Venicean businessman refers to other uses of the palace: “As far as throwing an arrow from the palace, a one-storey Haramsara is seen so large that 1000 women can live in it. In one side of it, there is a 4-yard (3657) kiosk decorated with enamel, gold and lapis. Here, the queen and her maides are busy with embroidery (Kentarini & Alsandri, 2003: 416-417). In the north, one can pass a place like a pray room, paved and surrounded by marbles. It is so big that it can include 300 horses and in Hasan Beygtimes, the rulers who came to the court demounted there. Here there is a door opening to the garden and a path that leads to the king’s palace whose gate has an arch with the height of 15 yards (13716 m) and width of 4 yards (3657m). Another door in the east, located in a big square opens to a garden. This door has a brick gate in arch form with the height of 3 yards (2.743 m) and width of 2 yards (1.828m) without any decorations. A lovely spring and basin are seen in its porch. Over this gate, a big upstairs with big rooms and an indoor hall were built with a view of the garden. When there was a ceremony in this square, HasanBeyg came to this mansion with many of his emirs. When ambassadors came to the mansion of Ozoonhasan, they were settled in this building from which the glorious view of the square was seen with a hospital inside (Ibid: 418). As Ovnollah said: “In HashtBehesht, there were a mosque, school, hospital, dining room, visiting room, and rest room of the king (Ovnollahi, 2009: 238-239).

Regarding given descriptions about upstairs, the supposition is that this place should be an entrance mansion with an indoor saloon and many rooms with a view of the garden. Also, the type of location function for settling the guests and ambassadors can be like the kiosk that the ruler prepared for entertaining the guests. This prevented from the entrance and exit of the strangers to the privacy of the ruler that was built far from it.

Based on the Venicean business man`s saying and referring to the miniature of Meraghchi, multiple functions of HashtBehesht got identified: By building a mosque, Ozoonhasan verified its religious function (Bani Masood, 2005: 9-10). Having different recreational, amusement, residential, governmental,
religious and private functions, this complex has all features of a garden city. In fact, gathering these sections around Tabriz, Ozoonhasan created a new complex which was a kind of the continuance of garden cities and multiple functions of Timur in Samarkand or a new start for the developed garden cities of Safavid era in Isfahan (Shahcheragi, 2009: 58; Mohebali, 2011: 27); (Fig.4).

Analyzing the evolutions and effects of HashtBehesht architecture in Tabriz on Iranian palaces and neighbor countries
Timurid architectural features penetrated into the furthest places of Islamic world (Okane, 1998: 256). Geographic location of Azerbaijan and political-martial conflicts with Ottoman government affected spreading architectural form of HashtBehesht and its reflection in creating Ottoman kiosk. Then, in the next era (Safavid times), such an architecture was transferred to the centeral Iran. Also, in relation to eastern Islamic lands, the presence of governmental agents of Indian Gurkanid and their good relation withSafavid era (Blair & Bloom, 2012: 710-719) was the cause of transferring HashtBehesht structure to the Indian continent.

Ottomankiosk: Chinili
A significant prototype impressed by HashtBehesht is Ottoman kioskChinili that Mohammad Faith Sultan build in TopkapiSaray of Istanbul in 877 A. H. Symmetrical and focused plan, a three dimensionalbay system, and tiling decoration were the elements of Timurid architecture but its undoubted patern that has disappeared now is seen in Tukmens’ mansions in western Iran and eastern Anatoli, especially HashtBehesht palace in Tabriz (Blair & Bloom, 2012: 106-107). Chinilikiosk is described as follows: Spatial organization of the mansion is similar to Iranian structures like HashtBehesht whose latest samples are left in Iran and India. But, the best and the most apparent information about it has been taken fromHashtBehesht descriptions in Tabriz, achieved during Aghghoyonloo rein. Its bay system is also indebted to Iranian patterns and examples (HashtBehesht palace in Tabriz); (Ibid); (Table 2).

About royal kiosk of Qazvin
By ending Aghghoyonloo rein and Safavid rulers seizing the power (907A. H.), Tabriz remained as the capital city of this monarchy in a way that all monarchy
era of Ismaeil Shah I and about a half of TahmasbShah I (930-962 A.H.)’s ruling were spent in this city.
So, they got government center of Aghghoyonloos.
SahebabadSquare and HashtBeheshtPalace were still used by early Safavid rulers. According to sayings, Ismaeil Shah came to Sahebabad Square and engaged himself with archery and when Ismaeil was there, there was music playing to his honor (Kentarini & Alsandri, 2003: 456). The author of “Islamic Architecture” describes Royal Kiosk of Qazvin: Royal Kiosk of Qazvin reveals some features of HashtBehesht in its immature stages (HelenBrand, 2014: 432). Since Tahmasb Shah lived in HashtBehesht Palace of Tabriz for many years, he demanded building a similar construction in Qazvin after transferring the capital city to Qazvin. Because, Royal Kiosk of Qazvin overlapped with HashtBehesht of Tabriz regarding the plan and entrance spaces although it underwent the elementary stage of adoption (Table 2).

HashtBehesht Palace of Isfahan
Two- storeykiosk known as HashtBehesht of Isfahan was built during the rein of Soleiman I or Safi II and has different features from other Safavidkiosks. Based on the historical texts, this place was built in 1079 A. H., referring to specific palaces built from ninth century A. H. in Harat and Tabriz.
The origin of such palaces should be sought in the Ottoman Palace in Istanbul that Indian Gurkanid rulers took advantage of it for their royal tombs as well (Blair & Bloom, 2014: 489-490; Okane, 998: 255-256). The entrance to this garden was through two luxurious gates that overlooked ChaharBagh (four gardens) and a large pond across it; while, the other overlooked the palace in the center of the garden (Rafiei Mehrabadi, 1973: 332) but, no trace of it remains at the present time. The garden was named “Nightingale Garden” or “Hasht Behesht” (Chardin, 1970: 326; Kampfer, 1971: 212).
Examining the plans and architectural elements and spaces of HashtBehesht Palace in Isfahan indicates that this palace was built after HashtBehesht of Tabriz; a palace that originates from a specific Timurid architectural style, a developing style that has
difficulties in the development of the plan and its internal spaces (Table 2).

Table 2. Plan adoption and internal spaces’ effects of HashtBehesht Palace on its successor palaces in Iran and beyond it. Source: authors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The plan of accessing different places of HashtBehesht of Tabriz (plan from the authors)</th>
<th>Spatial differentiation of HashtBehesht of Tabriz and its architecture (plan from the authors)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
evolved according to the time and place conditions to reach perfection (Table 2).

**Garden-tomb of Gurkanid Homayoonshah**

Zahir-Al-Din Mohammad Humayun, the son of Babur and the Indian emperor, is distinctive regarding Iranian features and interest in Iranian culture. During the reign of “ShirshahSur”, he spent 15 years in exile in Send, Iran and Afghanistan (Blair & Bloom, 2012: 695). Homayun who was abandoned from his land and had resorted to Iran and Shahtahmasb was welcomed by the king and decided to visit Tabriz and Ardebil in 952 A. H. (Eskandarbeig Turkman, 2003: 100). Homayoon Tomb that was the start of a new era in Indian architecture is an example of an Indian garden-tomb with a cross shaft and a pond, pool, and small kiosk in the garden has duplicated its beauty (Ruggles, 1997: 174; Ching, et al, 2006: 472). This type of plan that was known as Hasht Behesht was used in Timurid times (Blair & Bloom, 2012: 698). This place was proper for royal graveyard. This plan was used in Al-Jayto Tomb in Soltanieh, in Timur Tomb in Samarkand, and in Hasht Behesht Palace in Tabriz, indicating that its constructor was quite aware of Timurid architectural features. The considerable point to mention is that Homayoon and Hamideh (his wife) had visited Qazvin, Tabriz, and Soltanieh Dome during living in Iran (Ghoravi, 1969: 228-232). It is likely that his tomb-garden, built in 9 sections and eight dimensions with a two layer dome on the Geriv, was inspired by Hasht Behesht of Tabriz (Table 2).

**Tajmahal Tomb-Garden**

Golombok studies showed that Timurid gardens were the patterns of Tajmahal. Examples of Timurid gardens in Great Mongol era in 16-17th centuries AC were seen in Agra, Lahor, and Delhi. The most ordinary form of it was seen to be with a kiosk in the center of a pond, made with some channels in the intersection of the ponds. A perfect example of these gardens is Tajmahal where kiosk is at the end of the royal garden (Blair & Bloom, 2012: 711; Golombok, 2006: 139). It is worth mentioning that Tajmahal and Etemad-Al-Doleh Tomb both follow the 9 section octagon plan of Hasht Behesht in India. Tajmahal has manuscripts including religious points about doomsday and eternity (Ruggles, 1997: 175). This tomb was placed on a long stalk with its big onion-shaped dome and eight dimensional rooms in different agles were attached very artistically (Blair & Bloom, 2012: 712). Shahjahan built it at the memorial of his wife, Momtaz Mahal (Dehkhoda, 1955). In fact, Tajmahal is a type of garden-tomb where a tomb was compounded with a garden. Designing this structure was based on the Iranian architectural design and patterns (Soltanzadeh, 1998: 13). Golombok believes that Great Mongol gardens like Tajmahal originate from their ancestors’ (Timurid) gardens (Golombok, 2006: 137-139); (Table 2).

**Discussing spatial structure and the plan of Hasht Behesht Palace in Tabriz based on the Venetian tourist**

According to the notes of the Venetian tourist (Kentarini & Alsandri, 2003: 414-419) and Metraghchi’s miniature (Metraghchi, 1999: 87) which are the most reliable sources, Hasht Behesht Palace in Tabriz is built on a platform with the height of 1.5m and the width of 5 yard and 3 yard above which is decorated with marbles. Venetian tourist states:” This palace is built under a roof and it is a one-storey building; for getting the dome, rooms, and waiting rooms a stairway was built. Entrance to the rooms and waiting rooms is through the area below the dome. This building has four entrances from the ground floor and many rooms that are all tiled and decorated so amazingly that are hard to describe (Kentarini & Alsandri, 2003: 414-415). Although the itinerary refers to one floor of Hasht Behesht, everywhere in the text, a stairway is mentioned whose function is, according to the
author, accessing different sections of the complex. Apparently, a stairway’s function is getting upstairs while architectural proportion in Metraghchi’s Miniature, and Miniature of Tukmen School reveal a complex with architectural features of Azerbaijan and Timurid style that contradicts the complex having only one floor. It seems that from one floor, the author means only one floor above the main hall because in the following lines he stresses a ground floor that shows that there was another floor besides the ground floor. In the descriptions of the Venetian tourist from the internal space of the palace, dome room lacked direct lightening and its light came from the spatial connection of the rooms and shoe room. Since the internal section of all four rooms led to the dome room through the shoe room, architectural pattern of every section of HashtBehesht can be accepted only if the spatial connection of the rooms through a direct space that provides the possibility of symmetric access to every room becomes viable by passing the shoe room. This plan is viable if division space in four equal sides becomes a part of an octagon. In this case, modular contractual state will promote the homogeneity of the general plan and internal spaces. The itinerary provides the possibility of access to the dome room through four main entrances in four sides of the construction whose front side was paved by marble (Ibid: 415). In this study, by converting yard into meter, the height of the platform was achieved to be 1.37 m and its width 4.75 m. The height of the plinth was 2.743 m. Based on the documents, inferred architectural appearance of the palace and using marble in the plinth were impressed by the climate of northwestern Iran. Based on the notes of the Venetian businessman and regarding the existing miniature from HashtBehesht Palace in Tabriz, spatial structure and octagon plan of it were designed in a way that the schematic view of HashtBehesht Palace in Tabriz accords with Metraghchi’s miniature and the notes of Venetian businessman. For the ambiguity of the structural revolutions of Iranian palaces from the beginning of Islam till Timurid times, a point should be mentioned which is the difference between the early Islam’s palace structure and the palaces constructed after Mongol entrance to Iran. The palaces in early Islam like Tarmaz, Lashkari Bazar, and Ghazaneh are in the form of a palace-city in a wide area with different architectural spaces and the presence of the public in them was confirmed (Helenbrand, 2014, 414-412). But, the palaces built after the conquest of Mongols such as Abagakhan Palace in Takht Soleiman and Timurid kiosks in Samarkand and HashtBhesht in Tabriz were built individually and in a small size. Because, what was important for Mongols was preserving their blood origin and the lack of attention to themselves as the citizens. About Mongols, one comes across the stories about the tendency of nomads to preserve the purity and originality of their blood relationships. According to these customs, people who found their origin different, left the tribe and went to another place (Tasavof, 2009:87). Thus, despite early Islam, the palaces after Mongols were not palace-city but are individual palaces. According to Wilber and Golombek, HashtBhesht Palace of Ozoonhasan (Wilber and Golombek, 1988: 48-250; Wilber, 2011: 10-96) with an octagon plan and various functions (Bani Masood, 2005: 3-12) was built in Sahebabad Square (Bedelisi, 1997:126; Omrani and Aminian, 2006: 2-20). In this condition, based on the miniature of Metraghchi and Venetian tourist’s descriptions (Metraghchi, 1999:87; Kentarini & Alsandri, 2003: 414-419), this study differentiated spatial elements of HashtBhesht and the plan of access to the internal spaces of this palace was drawn and HashtBhesht palace of Tabriz was considered as the oldest example of octagon palaces of Safavid era, architectural spaces of Ottoman cultural area and Indian Gukanid government.
Conclusion

Inventing and spreading HashtBehesht structure was simultaneous with political-cultural trends around nineth and tenth centuries from Tabriz and Turkmens, blooming during Safavid monarchy in Iran and its neighbors. Thus, based on the historical documents, archeological evidences, and redesign of the plan and internal spaces of HashtBehesht palace of Tabriz, Ottoman ChiniliKiosk is the first example indebted to HashtBehesht palace of Tabriz. Shah Tahmasb I that spent more than half of his monarchy in Tabriz and got familiar with that style of architecture wanted to have one of them in his next capital city in Qazvin. Thus, by adopting the plan and other architectural details of Royal Kiosk of Qazvin with HashtBehesht palace of Tabriz, the reflection of HashtBehesht palace of Ozoonhasan in this palace is evident. The significant point is that historical resources have sought the origin of HashtBehesht Palace of Isfahan in ChiniliKiosk of Ottoman Sultan MohammadFatih. While, Ottoman ChiniliKiosk originates from HashtBehesht Palace of Tabriz. Thus, adopting the plan, architectural elements, entrances, and the number of the floors in HashtBehesht of Isfahan, architectural style of this palace is found to be inspired by Ozoonhasan palace. But, for the lack of architectural elements of Ozoonhasan palace, architectural style of HashtBehesht Palace of Isfahan is (wrongly) attributed to Ottoman ChiniliKiosk. Historical resources confirm the hypothesis that specific Timurid architectural style (mostly manifested in HashtBehesht Palace of Tabriz) became international and reached India via an intermediate such as HashtBehesht Palace of Isfahan. Inspired by the buildings of their ancestors, HashtBehesht Palace of Isfahan, Gurkanid emperors created garden-tombs like GurkanidHomayunshah’s Garden-Tomb and Tajmahal. Although architectural style of Iranian and Timurid gardens in these garden-tombs are evident, it is concluded that garden-aristocrat tents and the specific style of garden architecture and Timurid bay system play important roles in Turkman constructions of northwestern Iran, especially HashtBehesht Palace of Tabriz whose succession is seen in Ottoman ChiniliKiosk. At the end, GurkanidHomayunshah’s garden-tomb and Tajmahal in 10th century A. H., built in India many years after HashtBehesht Palace of Tabriz, originate from HashtBehesht Palace of Ozoonhasan in Tabriz.

Endnote
1. Movements of Timur around his territory were few and he settled in Samarkand gardens and around it. This custom is the common experience in Ilkhanid era since the settlement in the tents was very efficient in facilitating the affairs related to recreation, hunting, and martial movements (Golombek, 2006: 142).
2. Timur built a circle of royal gardens around Samarkand. They included Baghshomal, BaghEram, BaghBehesht, BaghDelgosha, Bagh No, BaghJahannama, BaghDeraz, BaghDolatabad, BaghTakhtGharacheh, and BaghGharatoopeh (Golombek, 2006: 140; Jackson and Lockhart, 2011: 119).
3. However, in some resources (Alamaray E Abbasi), this palace was attributed to the son of Ozoonhasan (Yaghoob) (EskandarbeygTurkman, 2003: 218-220).
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