



ALQĀB VA 'ANĀWĪN

ALQĀB VA 'ANĀWĪN, titles and forms of address, employed in Iran from pre-Islamic times.

i. *Alqab*.

ii. *'Anāwīn*.

iii. *Titles of Cities, Institutions, etc.*

i. *Alqāb*

Meaning and origin. The Arabic noun *laqab* (pl. *alqāb*) originally meant an approbatory or disapprobatory nickname. The use of *alqāb* has a long history in Iran; kings of kings, local dynasts, provincial kings, and heads of great families were distinguished by titles. As examples one may cite Geršāh, Pīšdād, Šēd, Mārdūš and Bēvarasb, Homāyūn, Tahamtan, Rō'īntan, and Čehrāzād applied respectively to the mythical and legendary kings and heroes Kayōmart, Hōšang, Jam, Žaḥḥāk, Kay Kōsrow, Rostam, Esfandiār, and Homā (Kōmānī). From the historical period may be mentioned Derāz-dast (Longimanus), Hūba-sonbā or Du'l-aktāf, Bezekār, Gōr, Zandīk, Anōšīravān, Abarvēz, and Šērōya for the Achaemenid Artaxerxes I and the Sasanians Šāpūr II, Yazdegerd I, Bahrām V, Kavād I, Kōsrow I, Kōsrow II, and Kavād II (see Bīrūnī, *Atār al-bāqīa*, pp. 101-04, 113, 121-22; *Chronology*, pp. 109-12, 117, 123). However, the main concern of this article is the use of *alqāb* in Islamic Iran, which can be divided into two periods: until the 4th/10th century, and



from then until early in the 14th/20th century. In the first phase, *alqāb* were given only to prophets, kings, and a few other important men. Thus Abraham was *Ḳalīlallāh*, Moses *Kalīmallāh*, and Moḥammad Amīn and Moṣṭawā. Each Shi'ite Imam had one or more *laqabs*, e.g., Ḥaydar and Mortazā for 'Alī, Mahdī and Qā'em for the twelfth Imam. According to the available dynastic lists, descriptive titles of some sort were applied to sixty-five of the ancient kings of Iran. Personal appellations were also given to the first four caliphs, to some of the Omayyad caliphs, to all of the 'Abbasid caliphs, to certain Companions of the Prophet and luminaries of Islam, and, in the early 'Abbasid period, to certain amirs and viziers. For example, the appellation given to Abū Moslem was Sayf Āl Moḥammad. Those given to some of the viziers and amirs were constructs of *dū* and a following noun such as *al-qalamayn* or *al-yamīnayn*. The *konya*, a construct of *abū* or *omm* much used among the Arabs since before Islam, also came into vogue among the Iranians and was to be a component of names, at least those of kings, until the Safavid period.

The word *laqab* is used, particularly in regard to the second phase, with the following meanings: 1. Official title. In this most characteristic use of the term, *laqab* is a title in the form of a construct of two nouns, the first being descriptive and complimentary, such as pillar, upper arm, splendor, and pride, and the second indicating the social function or institution with which the recipient is connected, such as fighting, writing, commerce, religion, community, and government. Titles of this type, which first appeared in the 4th/10th century and endured until the early part of the present century, from the start had an official (*dīvānī*) status and were conferred on a particular individual by the decree of a caliph or ruler; they became part of the recipient's full name and gave him distinction. Sometimes identical titles of this type were conferred simultaneously on more than one individual, e.g., *šarīf al-'olamā'* in the Qajar period. 2. Occupational title. Modeled on the official type, these were used in a wide range of occupations and originally were reserved for persons engaged in the specified occupation. Often the same title was held by several individuals, but in some cases, such as *malek al-šō'arā'*, it belonged to one man at a time. Sometimes the title became part of the holder's full name, e.g. *šayḵ al-eslām, emām-e ḵom'a*. 3. Generic epithets and compliments, and even forms of address, as in letter-writing (see below under 'Anāwīn). 4. Best-known name (see under 'Anāwīn; on pen-names, see under *Taḵallos*). Many famous men, including kings, generals, statesmen, 'olamā', Sufi shaikhs, mystics, poets, and writers are best known by appellations which they assumed, or which students, disciples, biographers, or the public gave to



them, during or after their lifetimes. Among the appellations given to shaikhs and mentors of Sufi orders, constructs ending in *al-dīn* were very common; those given to them by Shi'ite Sufis in recent times have often consisted of the first name followed by *'alīšāh*, e.g., Şafī-'Alīšāh.

Official titles from Buyid to Safavid times. The history of official titles as a social institution falls into three distinct periods: genesis and growth from the Buyids to the Saljuqs; relative stagnation from the Il-khanids to the Safavids; reinvigoration, overgrowth, and collapse under the Qajars. The genesis may be said to have occurred in 334/945 when the Buyid brothers forced the caliph to give them the titles Mo'ezz-al-dawla, Rokn al-dawla, and 'Emād-al-dawla, though titles of the same type had been given earlier in the century to two viziers and two amirs. Rokn-al-dawla's son obtained the title 'Azod-al-dawla wa Tāġ-al-mella, and the latter's son for the first time acquired a title containing the word *dīn*, namely Bahā'-al-dawla wa Neẓām-al-dīn. These were the first instances of the multiple title. The Buyid innovation was maintained by the Ghaznavids, who in the early 5th/11th century persuaded the caliphs to grant them titles such as Maḥmūd b. Sebūktigin's Yamīn-al-dawla wa Amīn-al-mella wa Kahf-al-eslām (cf. Bīrūnī, *Ātār al-bāqīa*, pp. 132-34; *Chronology*, pp. 129-30). All the later Buyid and Ghaznavid rulers acquired titles, and between the 4th/10th and 6th/12th centuries, titles became more widespread. The caliphs, Buyids, and Ghaznavids, and even the Samanids who eschewed titles for themselves, conferred titles ending in *al-dawla*, *al-molk*, and *al-dīn* on their generals and ministers. Among the Saljuq rulers, the first three obtained titles ending in *al-dawla* from the caliphs, the remainder titles in *al-dīn*, and all lavished similarly formed titles on their amirs and viziers; so too did the K̄vārazmšāhs. The undue proliferation of titles in the 6th/12th century is criticized by K̄vāja Neẓām al-molk (*Sīar al-molūk*, ed. H. Darke, Tehran, 1340 Š./1962, pp. 190-212; tr. idem, London, 1960, pp. 152-63).

Under the Il-khanids and Timurids, bestowal of titles of this type was cut down to some extent; they went mainly to viziers and *'olamā'* of Iranian origin. The Mongol and Turkish rulers and generals used the appellation *khan* and showed no desire for titles in *al-dawla*, *al-mella*, etc., though some of them were known by their Mongol titles. Sometimes titles such as Qotloġ Solṭān or Qotloġ Khan were given to Turkish and Iranian dignitaries. Titles in *al-dawla*, which in earlier times had usually been conferred on men of the sword, went in the Il-khanid period to men of the pen, including Jewish and Christian viziers, *'olamā'* and Sufis. Notable examples are Argūn Khan's Jewish vizier



Sa'd-al-dawla and his relatives, and Gāzān Khan's Jewish vizier Rašīd-al-dawla, whose title was changed to Rašīd-al-dīn after his conversion to Islam, titles in *al-dīn* being reserved for Muslims. The use of titles in *aldīn* by rulers, ministers, and generals, which had been very common ever since the 5th/11th century, was to continue for two or three centuries more; but excessive proliferation gradually removed them from the range of *dīvānī* titles and brought them to the level of popular appellations and, in the long run, personal names.

The Safavid kings did not assume personal honorific titles on the model of earlier dynasties, though they maintained the custom of Shaikh Ṣafī's descendants in calling themselves Kalb-e Āstān-e 'Alī. The word khan, as a designation, title, and rank, was reserved for the great governors (*wālīs*), who were men of the sword and for the most part Turks; *bēg* and *solṭān* were titles given to officers of less high rank. The *dīvānī* titles were few in number and either reserved for a particular office or descriptive of the function, e.g., *e'temād al-dawla* for the prime minister, *mastawfī-al-mamālek* for the finance minister. Throughout the Il-khanid, Timurid, and Safavid periods, it was of course customary in correspondence and communication with kings, commanders, and officials to use the appropriate titles, epithets, and forms of address (see 'Anāwīn).

Official titles in the Qajar period. Official titles passed through three stages under the Qajars: reinvigoration under Faṭḥ-'Alī Shah (r. 1212-50/1797-1834), inflation under Nāṣer-al-dīn Shah (r.1264-1313/1848-96), devaluation and collapse under Moẓaffar-al-dīn Shah (r.1313-24/1896-1907) and Aḥmad Shah (r.1327-42/1909-24). In the first stage, the highest *dīvānī* title was *e'temād-al-dawla*, given on the Safavid precedent to the prime minister. Faṭḥ-'Alī Shah conferred during his reign some fifty titles in *al-dawla* and *al-salṭana* on royal princes (approximately 17), ladies of his harem, and eminent men. During Nāṣer-al-dīn Shah's reign, the award of official titles increased rapidly. A computation of the titles conferred by this shah in the first forty years of his reign (*E'temād-al-salṭana, al-Ma'āṭer wa'l-āṭār*, Tehran, 1306/1889, pp. 230-42) indicates their types: Out of a total of 618, approximately 218 were generic occupational titles based on the name of the function, and approximately 400 were honorific *dīvānī* titles; in the construction of the titles, approximately 130 first nouns and 40 second nouns were used. 'Abdallāh Mostawfī (*Šarḥ-e zendagānī-ye man* I, Tehran, 1324 Š./1945, p. 591) estimated that 250 first nouns were available, which together with 40 second nouns gave a total of ten



thousand potential titles. G. P. Churchill's *Biographical Notices* (pp. i-iv) shows 181 first nouns and 9 second nouns.

The first noun was a descriptive word chosen to fit the recipient's function and rank. Among those in use were 17 work-description nouns, e.g., *mostawfī*; 14 nouns denoting leadership, e.g., *ṣadr*, *solṭān*; 11 meaning support or reliance, e.g., *rokn*, *ḡahīr*; 12 indicating good fortune or success, e.g., *sa'd*, *naṣr*; 9 indicating honesty or fidelity, e.g., *amīn*, *e'temād*; 9 meaning light, e.g., *šo'ā'*, *meṣbāḡ*; 9 denoting grandeur, e.g., *heṣmat*, *majd*; 5 denoting weapons, e.g., *ṣārem*; and about 14 with various other meanings. In addition, the titles of harem ladies contained about 30 first nouns, some in common use as women's names, others of a complimentary nature. There were a few shared nouns, acceptable in both men's and women's titles but followed by different second nouns, e.g., *noṣrat-aldawla* for men and *noṣrat-al-moluk* for women. Certain nouns could be placed either first or second but with different meanings, e.g., *amīr-e neẓām* (*neẓām* here meaning the modern army) and *neẓām-al-'olamā'*.

The second noun was the most important part of the title. Its choice was proportioned to the recipient's social or governmental rank and function. An analysis of 400 titles with reference to the rank or function of the holder and the frequency of the second noun shows the following distribution: royal princes and eminent men, 189 titles comprising 50 *al-dawla*, 31 *al-salṭana*, 73 *almolk*, 8 *al-mamālek*, and 27 others such as *al-solṭān*, *dīvān*, *tawlīa*, *ektīār*; harem ladies, 81 titles comprising 23 *al-dawla*, 31 *al-salṭana*, 18 *al-molūk*, and 9 others; harem staff, 15 titles ending in *ḡaram*, *ḡoẓūr*, or *kalwat*; army officers, 15 titles ending in *neẓā'ām* or *laškar*; officials, 21 titles ending in *al-weẓāra*, *al-'adāla*, etc.; *'olamā'* and *sayyeds*, 24 titles ending in *al-'olamā'*, *alsādāt*, *al-aṣraf*, *al-dākerīn*, *al-wā'ezīn*, *al-eslām*, *al-ṣarī'a*; physicians, poets, and writers, 38 titles with second nouns such as *al-aṭebbā'*, *al-šo'arā'*, *al-kottāb*, *al-odabā'*, *al-ḡokamā'*, *al-'olūm*; merchants, 7 titles all ending in *al-tojḡār*. Also important as military titles were *sepahdār*, *sepahsālār*, and nouns such as *amīr* and *sardār* followed by nouns or adjectives such as *ḡang*, *eqtedār*, *mojāhed*, *mokarram*.

Both the first and the second words, and also the whole constructs, were hierarchically graded "according to the meanings and the sweetness or grandeur of the words and the frequency or infrequency of their use" (Hendūšāh Naḡjavānī, *Tajāreb al-salaf*, p. 350). Other factors were contemporary protocol and the standing of holders of a particular type of title. Having been held in old times by kings and more recently by viziers, titles in *al-dawla* bore the greatest prestige. Those in *al-salṭana* were given mainly to



royal favorites and harem ladies, those in *al-mamālek* mainly to holders of particular offices, e.g., *mostawfī-al-mamālek*, and those in the lower-rated *al-molk* to middle rank officers. Among the most prestigious first nouns were *āṣaf*, *maǧd*, *ẓahīr*, *rokn*, *e'temād*, and *mošīr* (counselor). A title's rating was also determined by the quality of the whole construct; for example, Mīrẓā Naṣrallāh Khan Nā'inī was promoted from Meṣbāḥ-al-molk to Mošīr-al-molk and finally to Mošīr-al-dawla (Bāmdād, *Reǧāl* IV, pp. 351f.). The holder's standing and rank was also a significant factor in the importance of a title; for example, the six holders of the title *mošīr-al-dawla* in the Qajar period were all either prime minister, foreign minister, or minister. On account of this association of title with status in the social and to some extent the official hierarchy, eminent men often obtained title promotion on or after job promotion. An estimate based on data in biographies shows that about a quarter of the leading figures of the Qajar period held two successive titles, and about one-tenth three or more, in the course of their careers.

Although titles, like appointments and occupations, tended up to a point to become hereditary, various factors such as the rating of the title, the standing of the prospective heir, and the influence of other claimants, determined what actually happened. The research alluded to above shows that about one-third of the titles under study were inherited and about one-half were acquired by award; relevant data on the remainder is unavailable.

In the last decade of Nāṣer-al-dīn Shah's reign, 'Alī-Aṣḡar Khan Amīn-al-soltān, the prime minister, in order to broaden his influence, obtained the shah's approval for a large number of title-grants. According to Mostawfī (*Šarḥ-e zendagānī* I, p. 591), from 50 to 100 gold *panǧhazārī*s were presented by the recipient in exchange for a firman bestowing such a *laqab*. Nāṣer-al-dīn Shah made some efforts to curb the proliferation of titles, but without success. More than once he sought relief from the importunity of his courtiers by temporarily ceasing to grant titles; E'temād-al-saltāna mentions one such occasion in 1303/1886 (*Rūz-nāma-ye kāṭerāt*, ed. Ī. Afšār, 2nd ed., Tehran, 1350 Š./1971, p. 439). In the same year he ordered the compilation of a register of all existing titles, but only the preface and a small number of entries were completed, with the title *Tartīb al-alqāb*, by Malek-al-šo'arā' Šabā. Nāṣer-al-dīn Shah also signed a law of military ranks and distinctions, which limited the number of generals (*sardār*) to five and of divisional commanders (*amīr-e tūmān*) to seven, and a code of governmental distinctions. Section 15 of this code specified five norms for the grant of a title: merit, exceptional service,



possession of sufficient wealth to maintain the title's dignity, due proportion between the title and the recipient's social standing, and title-selection from the conventional stock along with prohibition of innovatory formulation. The code also prescribed prison penalties and fines for persons who assumed titles without royal authority (*Rūz-nāma-ye Īrān*, year 1311/1894, nos. 822, 830).

Under Moẓaffar-al-dīn Shah and Aḥmad Shah, so many titles were issued that the whole system collapsed. The requirement of a royal firman was dropped during Moẓaffar-al-dīn Shah's reign; thereafter a title was granted by a mere warrant (*dastkaṭṭ*). The clerks and scribes in the royal court dished out ten or even twenty warrants in a day and received a rake-off when they could (Mostawfī, *Šarḥ-e zendagānī* I, p. 591). Not even the warrants were really necessary. Anyone could pass for a titled person by having a title of his own choice engraved on his seal. Another method was to send a letter signed with the self awarded title to the shah or the prime minister, and to treat the reply bearing this title in the address as evidence of its authority. Furthermore many provincial governors and tribal chiefs gave titles to their subordinates. Consequently there were not many men of any standing in late Qajar times who lacked a title.

From the start of the struggle for constitutional government, criticism of titles was expressed and satirical verses about them were composed. Notable examples are a poem by Adīb-al-mamālek Farāhānī (*Dīvān*, Tehran, 1312 Š./1933, pp. 323-24) and a letter in the newspaper *Ḥabl-al-matīn* (Tehran, 1325/1908, no. 213). Nevertheless, even the Democrats, who were considered radical and progressive, kept their titles. Finally, at the time of the change of dynasty, titles were formally abolished by the law of 1304 Š./1925 for the abolition of titles, (former) military ranks, and official designations. For many years, however, leading men continued to be known unofficially by their former titles. Having to assume a family name—made compulsory by another law of 1304 Š./1925—such men often chose one reminiscent of the old title, e.g., Dr. Moḥammad Moṣaddeq who had been Moṣaddeq-al-salṭana, and Aḥmad Qawām, who had been Qawām-al-salṭana. Another practice was to put the old title under the first name and the new family name on visiting cards.

The use of royal titles was revived when the late Moḥammad Rezā Shah Pahlavi assumed the title Āryāmeh̄r in 1344 Š./1965.



BIBLIOGRAPHY

See also C. E. Bosworth, "Laḳab," *EI*².

The main sources for titles and epithets of kings are the catalogues of their coins and seals, especially R. S. Poole, *The Coins of the Shahs of Persia, Safavids, Afghans, Efsharis, Zands and Kajars*, London, 1887.

H. L. Rabino di Borgomale, *Coins, Medals and Seals of the Shahs of Iran (1500-1941)*, London, 1945.

S. J. Torābī Ṭabāṭabā'ī, *Sekkahā-ye Āq Qoyunlū*, Tabrīz, 2535/1976.

E. von Zambauer, *Die Munzprägungen des Islams*, Wiesbaden, 1968. O. Codrington, *A Manual of Musulman Numismatics*, London, 1904.

Important sources for kings of both Islamic and pre-Islamic Iran, prophets, and caliphs include such historical works as K̄vārazmī, *Mafātīḥ al-'olūm*, ed.

G. van Vloten, 1895, pp. 98-107.

Bīrūnī, *Āṭār al-bāqīa*, pp. 35-103.

Gardīzī, ed. Ḥabībī, pp. 46-48, 57-59, 98, 191.

Mojmal, pp. 417-19, 426-30.

Cf. Š. Kīā, "Āryāmehr," *Honar o mardom* 37, 1344 Š./1965, pp. 2-17.

See also books on Islamic dynasties, especially S. Lane-Poole, *The Mohammadan Dynasties*, London, 1894.

Zambauer. C. E. Bosworth, *The Islamic Dynasties*, Edinburgh, 1967.

Justi, *Namenbuch*. For discussions of titles, see Hendūšāh Naḳjavānī, *Tajāreb al-salaf*, ed.

'A. Eqbāl, Tehran, 1313 Š./1934, passim and pp. 349-50.

K̄vāndmīr, *Dostūr al-wozarā'*, ed. S. Nafīsī, Tehran, 1317 Š./1938.



Tadkerat al-molūk. Mīrzā Rafi'ā, *Dastūr al-molūk*, ed.

M. T. Dānešpažūh, supplement to *MDAT* 16/5-6, 1347-48 Š./1968-69.

Works that are particularly helpful for titles of 'olamā', poets, Sufis, and authors include *Nāma-ye dānešvarān*, 7 vols., Tehran, 1296-1324/1879-1906.

Ḳvānsārī, *Rawzat al-ĵannāt*, Tehran, 1307/1890.

M. 'A. Modarres, *Rayḥānat al-adab*, 8 vols., Tabrīz, n.d.

Moḥammad Ma'šūm Šīrāzī, *Tarā'eq al-ḥaqā'eq*, ed.

M. J. Maḥjūb, Tehran, 1339 Š./1960.

See also C. E. Bosworth, "The Titulature of the Early Ghaznavids," *Oriens* 15, 1962, pp. 210-33.

L. Richter-Bernburg, "Amīr-Malik-Shāhānshāh: 'Aḍud al-Daula's Titulature Re-examined," *Iran* 18, 1980, pp. 83-102.

W. Madelung, "The Assumption of the Title Shāhānshāh by the Būyids and the Reign of the Daylam (Dawlat el-Daylam)," *JNES* 28, 1969, pp. 84-108, 169-83.

'A. Zaryāb, "Se nokta dar bāraye Rašīd-al-dīn Faẓlallāh," *Majmū'a-ye ḳatābahā-ye taḥqīqī dar bāra-ye Rašīd al-dīn Faẓlallāh Hamadānī*, Tehran, 1350 Š./1971, pp. 123-35.

See also general works dealing with *alqāb*, such as Qalqašandī, *Sobḥ al-a'šā fī ṣenā'at al-enšā'*, vols. V and VI, Cairo, 1915.

Ḥasan al-Bāšā, *al-Alqāb al-eslāmīya fī'l-tārīḳ wa'l-watā'eq wa'l-ātār*, Cairo, 1957.

Ebn al-Fowaṭī, *Talkīš maĵma' al-ādāb fī moĵam al-alqāb*, ed. M. Jawād, 3 vols., Damascus, 1962-65.

Qajar period: 'Azod-al-dawla, *Tārīḳ-e 'Azodī*, ed.

'A. Navā'ī, Tehran, 1355 Š./1976.

A satirical list of proposed titles for princes is given in Rostam-al-ḥokamā', *Rostam al-tawārīḳ*, ed. M. Mošīrī, Tehran, 1348 Š./1969, pp. 467-71.



A list of titles during the first forty years of Nāṣer-al-dīn Shah's reign is provided by E'temād-al-salṭana, *al-Ma'āter wa'l-āṭār*, Tehran, 1307/1889, pp. 230-42.

Important Qajar biographical works should also be consulted: Bāmdād, *Rejāl*. Mīrzā Moḥammad-'Alī Mo'allem Ḥabībābādī, *Makārem al-āṭār*, 5 vols., Isfahan, 1337-55 Š./1958-76.

D. 'A. Mo'ayyer-al-mamālek, *Rejāl-e 'aṣr-e Nāṣerī*, Tehran, 1361 Š./1982-83.

Fasā'ī, part 2, pp. 23-154. M. Šabā, "Tartīb-e alqāb," *FIZ* 19, 1352 Š./1973, pp. 63-88.

H. Picot, *Biographical Notices of Members of the Royal Family, Notables, Merchants, and Clergy*, London, FO 881/7028, 1897.

G. P. Churchill, *Biographical Notices of Persian Statesmen and Notables*, London, FO 881/9748, 1909.

Biographies of the Notables of Fars and Certain Persian Officials who have Served at Shiraz, IOR L/P + S/20 C207, Delhi, 1935.

See also P. Šahnavāz, *Alqab-e dawlatī, 'elmī, adabī, va maḏhabī dar dawra-ye Qājārīya*, unpublished M.A. thesis in library science, Tehran University, 1352 Š./1973.

Ī. Afšār, "Šaš Mošīr-al-dawla," *Sawād o bayāz* II, Tehran, 1349 Š./1970, pp. 243-59.

Ḥ. Bāybūrdī, "Nezām-al-dawlahā," *Waḥīd* 7, 1349 Š./1970, pp. 611-20.

Idem, "Alqab-e Qā'em-maqāmhā," *ibid.*, pp. 419-25.

Idem, "Amīr Nezāmhā," *ibid.*, pp. 656-59.

Idem, "Mo'tamad-al-dawlahā," *ibid.*, 8, 1349 Š./1970, pp. 193-96.

H. Sa'adat Nūrī, "Āṣaf-al-dawlahā," *Yaḡmā* 15, 1341 Š./1962, pp. 379-81, 423-27, 462-66, 522-27, 560, 566; 16, 1342 Š./1963, pp. 83-87, 179-87.

Idem, "E'temād-al-dawlahā, Ḥosām-al-dawlahā, va Zāhīr-al-dawlahā," *Yaḡmā* 13, 1339 Š./1960, pp. 138-42.



Idem, “Sepahsālārḥā,” *Yağmā* 18, 1344 Š./1965, pp. 640-43; 19, 1345 Š./1966, pp. 77-81, 406-16.

Idem, “Rokn-al-dawlahā,” *Waḥīd* 4, 1346 Š./1967, pp. 585-93.

J. Matīnī, “Baḥṭī dar bāra-ye sawābeq-e tārik-e alqāb o ‘anāwīn-e ‘olamā dar maḍḥab-e šī‘a,” *Iran Nameh* 1/4, 1362 Š./1983, pp. 560-608.

ii. ‘Anāwīn

Meaning and origin. The Arabic word ‘*onwān* (pl. ‘*anāwīn*) originally meant the address at the head of a letter and subsequently acquired further related meanings. According to Moḥammad b. Hendūšāh Naḵjavānī (*Dostūr al-kāteb fī ta’yīn al-marāteb* I, p. 6), expression of respect for dignity and rank should be done by “specifying the addressee’s rank—such as king, sultan, amir, vizier, great dignitary, lesser dignitary, magnate, or notable—and by writing or uttering titles, prayers, and address formulae befitting the worth and status of each.” The complete ‘*onwān* of a letter was made up of four main parts: the principal designation or address formula (*keṭāb*), components of the person’s name, titles and generic epithets of a complimentary nature, and prayers. In the course of time, the word ‘*onwān* came to be applied not only to the whole but also to each of the above-mentioned parts except the prayers. Although by definition the ‘*onwān* should be placed at the head of the letter, this was not always the case. According to the rules, it should be placed in the top quarter of the back of the sheet, so that after the folding of the sheet it would lie above the text of the letter; furthermore, the ‘*onwān* should contain the principal designations of both the sender and the recipient. In practice, however, depending on the nature of the letter and the rank of the recipient, the principal designations might be placed either at the head of the letter or inside it after lines of poetry, Koranic verses, or references to third parties.

Appropriate forms, wordings, and combinations of ‘*onwān* parts for each class in the social hierarchy—men of the sword, men of the pen, ‘*olamā*, merchants, and craftsmen—were composed and incorporated in books by correspondence experts (*motarasselān*) and clerks (*monšīān*). As an example, the ‘*onwān* of a letter from the K̄vārazmšāh Jalāl-al-dīn to the Saljuq sultan of Rūm ‘Alā’-al-dīn Keyqobād I may be quoted: “(To) the exalted presence of the august sultan [principal designation]; the wise, just, divinely aided, and victorious fighter in the holy war and guardian of the frontier [additional designations]; ‘Alā’-al-donyā wa’l-dīn [personal title]; strengthener of Islam and the Muslims, pride



of kings . . . [appropriate generic epithets]; may he forever be exalted and defend the realm! [prayers]" (Text in M. Tābetī, *Asnād o nāmahā-ye tārikī*, p. 193). The lower the rank of the addressee, the smaller was the number of words put into each part of the 'onwān. It was even possible to omit the prayers and the titles and epithets altogether.

Prolivity and artificiality in epistolary forms of address appeared in the 4th/10th century and prevailed during the next two centuries, when the gradual penetration of the Arabic epistolary style into Persian offered ample scope for word jugglery. Under the Saljuqs and K̄vārazmšāhs, the designations and complimentary epithets in the forms of address exceeded all proportion (for a critical observation see Neẓām-al-molk, *Sīar al-molūk*, ed. H. Darke, Tehran, 1340 Š./1962, p. 210; tr. idem, London, 1960, p. 160).

Jengiz Khan prohibited titles and complimentary epithets (Jovaynī, I, p. 19), but the use of verbal artifice in epistolary 'anāwīn continued. Under the Timurids, Qara Qoyunlū, and Āq Qoyunlū, a style influenced by Ottoman court practices arose; it matured under the Safavids and lasted with little change until the Qajar period. Its characteristics were greater emphasis on the principal designation, modification of the form of expression of compliments, and reduced importance of prayers.

Principal designation. The principal designation or address formula, being the permanent and operative element, is the most important part of an epistolary form of address. Designations of some kind are still used today. There were two types, formal and official (*dīvānī*) and informal. 1. An official form of address consisted of two parts, the principal and the additional (*far'ī*) designations. The most commonly used principal designations were complimentary descriptions of rank or position which had been in vogue since Buyid times and had spread to all Islamic countries. Among them were the Persian nouns *dargāh*, *bārgāh*, *pīšgāh*, and the Arabic nouns *ḥaẓra*, *janāb*, *jāneb*, *maqarr*, *maqām*, and adjectives compounded from 'ālī or *a'lā* and *jāh*, *ša'n* or *qadr*. Particular functions were designated by complimentary words such as *solṭān*, *amīr*, *kān*, *wazīr*, or *šayk*, *mawlānā*, *k̄vāja*, *šāḥeb*, *šadr*, 'amīd, and *sayyed*. Closeness to the ruler was indicated by words such as *moqarrab*, *mo'tamad*, and *fadawī*. Special merit was signaled by adjectives such as *awḥad*, *fāẓel*, 'ālem, and by nouns such as 'omda, *qodwa*, *zobda*, and *natīja*, normally in construct with a following noun. A functional designation was usually accompanied by an honorific adjective, varying with the rank and also with contemporary protocol, such as *a'ẓam*, *mo'aẓẓam*, *kabīr*, *a'lā*, 'ālī, *ašraf*,



šarīf, akram, karīm, sāmī, raft‘.

In the first Iranian dynasties, the designation *amir* was used in accordance with Islamic state protocol, and in the 4th/10th century *amir al-omarā*’ was used. The designation *solṭān* appears to have been first acquired by the Ghaznavid Sultan Maḥmūd b. Sebūktigin, and was applied to rulers at most times from then until early in the 14th/20th century. The pre-Islamic designation *šāhanšāh* was revived by the Buyids, and while not a formal designation of subsequent rulers, was much used unofficially and in letters. Only in the Qajar and Pahlavi periods did *šāhanšāh* become the main component of the royal designation. The Il-khans were addressed as *khan*. The word *kāqān*, current in Turkestan since the 4th/10th century, was also used as a royal designation until the end of the Qajar period. The word *khan*, which had been both an appellation and a position, in the course of time became a designation of governors and commanders who were chiefs of Turkish tribes; later it became a designation of military men in general, and finally a polite word of address to all and sundry. The Safavid kings used the designations *solṭān-e ‘ādel bahādor kān*, which had precedents in earlier dynasties. The royal designations of the Qajars were *solṭān-e a‘zam*, *kāqān*, and *šāhanšāh*, preceded by *ālā-ḥazrat-e homāyūn*.

?The prevalent designations of viziers and men of the pen in and after the 4th/10th century were *k̄vāja* and *šāḥeb* (master), usually followed by *bozorg*, *a‘zam*, etc. At first the designation *k̄vāja* had a high value and was not given to all viziers and high officials, but in later centuries it became very common, though it was still selectively applied in communications from rulers to officials. This use of the word lasted until the 10th/16th century. Having then been made a designation of harem guards, *k̄vāja* eventually came to mean eunuch.

The principal designation of military commanders was *amīr* or *amīr al-omarā*’. Also used were constructs of *omarā*’ with a preceding noun such as *sayyed*, *malek*, *‘amda*, *zobda*, *natīja*, and with the following plural adjective *‘ezām*. The usual designations of *‘olamā*’ and mystics were *janāb* or *‘ālī janāb* together with *mawlānā* and *šayk*.

The principal designations of top-ranking governors and court officials under the Safavids were *‘ālī-jāh*, *moqarrab al-kāqān*, *moqarrab al-ḥazra*, and *‘ālī-ḥazra*, usually with preceding additional designations; e.g., for a great governor (*wālī*), *īalat o šawkat-panāh*, *ḥešmat o jalālat-dastgāh* [additional



designations], *'ālī-jāh* [principal designation, followed by titles and complimentary epithets] (M. Sotūda, *Az Āstārā tā Astārābād VI*, p. 52). For less exalted officials, the designations resembled the additional designations of the men at the top. Among other designations then in use, *khan*, *solṭān*, and *bēg* were reserved for military commanders holding a rank of governor (*ḥākem*).

The Qajars at first adhered to the Safavid models, but, having devalued the designations *'ālī-jāh* and *moqarrab* by giving them to too many persons, they replaced them by *janāb*, a form of address used since Buyid times and still greatly appreciated. Sons of the shah were addressed as *nawwāb* with the adjective *vālā*, and ministers as *janāb* with *ašraf*, *arfa'*, *a'zam*, *amjad*, or *mostaṭāb*. The designations of military commanders and tribal chiefs were *amīr al-omarā'*, *'omdat al-omarā'*, or *'omdat al-ḳawānīn* followed by the plural adjective *'eẓām*. Both military and civilian holders of top positions received designations indicative of closeness to the shah or government and made up of words such as *mo'tamad*, *mo'tamen*, *fadawī*, and *moqarrab* followed by *al-solṭān*, *al-ḳāqān*, *al-wezāra*. The designation *'ālī-jāh*, followed in descending order of rank by *moqarrab al-ḳāqān*, *moqarrab al-ḥaẓrat al-ḳāqānīya*, and *moqarrab al-ḥaẓrat al-'ālīya*, was given to both soldiers and civilians; standing alone it was given to men of middle rank such as colonels (*sarhangs*), *kalāntars* (superintendents of guilds), *kadḳodās* (headmen of guilds and villages), and substantial merchants. Lower ranking persons, such as captains and ordinary merchants, were addressed as *'ālī-ša'n*, and master craftsmen as *'ālī-qaḍr*. These principal designations were accompanied by whatever additional designations contemporary etiquette might require, such as *moqaddas-alqāb* and *efādat o efādat-neṣāb* for '*olamā'*'; *īālat o šawkatpanāh*, *emārat-dastgāh*, *faḳāmat-ektenāh* for holders of high offices; and *'ezzat-panāh*, *ṣadāqat-hamrāh* for merchants and craftsmen. The various conventions were written down in 1279/1862 in a rulebook called *Resāla-ye tarqīm o taškīṣ-e alqāb* (FIZ 19, 1352 Š./1973, pp. 50-61), and on the whole were respected. In practice, however, there was a tendency to give higher designations to lower-ranking persons. Consequently *janāb* and *khan* became the only sought-after designations and the only ones to be conferred by royal decree. They too were over-lavishly bestowed in the later Qajar period. A code of governmental distinctions issued by Nāṣer-al-dīn Shah restricted the grant of *janāb* to ministers, ambassadors, generals, divisional commanders, members of the council of state (*dār al-šūrā-ye dawlatī*, senior governors, and persons who had rendered meritorious services (*Rūz-nāma-ye Īrān 830, 1311/1894*); but the code proved ineffective, and excessive bestowal of *janāb* continued.



Most of these designations were abolished by the titles abolition law of 1304 Š./1925, but a few were kept during the Pahlavi period. Among them were *a'lā-ḥaẓrat-e homāyūn-e šāhānšāh* for the shah, *'olyā-ḥaẓrat* for the queen, *vālā-ḥaẓrat* for immediate princes and princesses, and *vālā-gohar* for royal grandchildren. During the early years of the Pahlavi period, the premier and other ministers, ambassadors, and provincial governors were usually addressed as *janāb-e ašraf* and *janāb-e mostaṭāb-e aǰall*, and military commanders as *ḥaẓrat-e aǰall*, even though the official designation for these ranks was only *janāb*. In the early part of Moḥammad Reżā Shah's reign, the designation *janāb-e ašraf* was conferred on Aḥmad Qawām during his premiership, subsequently cancelled, and later reconferred. In the last part of the reign, certain confidants of the royal court were addressed as *janāb*. The official designation of women who became ministers, assistant ministers, and ambassadors during the reign was *janāb-e bānū*.

2. In popular forms of address, the usual designations are either words which had belonged to the formal vocabulary and in the course of time became vulgarized, or words which from the start have been current in informal speech. They are normally attached to the first name and treated as a component of the full name. Several categories of informal designation may be distinguished: (a) Distinctions of genealogy, such as *sayyed*, *mīr*, *mīrzā*, *šarīf* placed before the name of a *sayyed*; or *mīrzā* placed after the name as a designation of a son or descendant of a king. (b) Distinctions of social status, as popularly conceived in recent centuries, such as *khan* following the name of a military commander, *mīrzā* preceding the name of a man of the pen, *shaikh*, *ākūnd*, or *mollā* preceding the name of a cleric. (c) Words of respect current in the 13th/19th century, such as *āqā* (master), *ḵānom* (mistress), *khan* (chief). (d) Designations of pilgrims, such as *ḥāǰǰ* or *ḥāǰǰī* for one who has visited the Ka'ba, and *Karbalā'ī* or *Mašhadī* for one who has visited Imam Ḥosayn's or Imam Reżā's resting place. At the present time, the normal words of address in correspondence and conversation are *Āqā* (Mr.) and *Ḵānom* or *Bānū* (both meaning either Mrs. or Miss). Also in general use are two academic or professional designations, *doktor* (for anyone with an M.D. or Ph.D.) and *mohandes* (for architects and engineers). During the 1350s/1970s there was a ban on the use of academic designations in official correspondence, but it was ineffective. After the revolution of 1357 Š./1978, brother and sister were used instead of *Āqā* and *Ḵānom* in official correspondence and communications to mass media and also by supporters of the Islamic Republic in ordinary conversation. The designation *ḥojjat al-eslām* was given to all clerics having



completed the preliminary (*moqaddamātī*) stage of theological study, *āyatallāh* to those having completed the final (*kārej*) stage and obtained an authorization (*ejāza*) to act as a *mojtahed*, and *āyatallāh al- 'oẓmā* (pl. *āyat-e 'eẓām*) to those qualified for final jurisdiction (*marjā'iyat*). The full designation given to the revolution's leader was *Ḥāzrat-e Āyatallāh al- 'Oẓmā Emām Kōmeynī madda zelloho 'l- 'ālī* (His Eminence the Great *āyatallāh*, the Imam Kōmeynī—may his august [protective] shadow be lengthened!). *Āyatallāh*, *ḥoġġat al-eslām*, and *teqat al-eslām* had originally been the personal designations of three great theologians, 'Allāma Ḥellī (d. 726/1325), Moḥammad Ġazālī (d. 505/1111), and Moḥammad Kolaynī Rāzī respectively; they only began to be generalized in the Qajar period.

Compliments and prayers. The compliments in epistolary forms of address were epithets taken from the stock of polite nouns and constructs in use at any time, and were applied generically to official ranks and social classes. They thus differed from official and unofficial titles (*alqāb*) in two ways: (a) They were usually multiple, rhymed, and embellished. (b) They were not specific to individuals, but generic. For example: *senān al-dawla wa'l-dīn*, *ḥosām al-eslām wa'l-moslemīn*, *'omdat al-molūk wa'l-salāṭīn* [to amirs]; *šams al-ḥaqq wa'l-donyā wa'l-dīn*, *ġīāt al-eslām wa'l-moslemīn*, *mošīr al-solṭān wa'l-salāṭīn* [to viziers and secretaries]; *nezām al-mella wa'l-dīn*, *qewām al-eslām wa'l-moslemīn*, *mofīd al-molūk wa'l-salāṭīn* [to 'olamā]. In the Safavid period compliments came to be expressed by adverbial phrases to distinguish them from personal titles. For example: *nezāman le'l-dawla wa'l-mella wa'l-dīn* was written instead of *nezām al-dawla wa'l-mella wa'l-dīn*. There was no change in the convention that the first word should be complimentary and the second word function-related. In the Qajar period, less emphasis was laid on compliments and more on principal and additional designations; but old-style compliments continued to be used in ordinary correspondence and particularly in letters to 'olamā'.

Epistolary prayers were usually in both Persian and Arabic. The often lengthy Persian prayers normally consisted of wishes that the addressee might enjoy success, prosperity, or glory and be preserved in his life, kingship, governorship, or fortune for a long time or forever. The Pahlavi text *Nāmak nibēsišnīh* (tr. R.Zaehner, *BOAS* 9, 1937-39, pp. 93-109) gives examples of similar wishes in Sasanian epistolary address formulae. The Arabic prayers were usually brief, consisting of two or three words such as “may God perpetuate, consolidate, grant, aid, prolong” followed by “his kingship” or “reign” [to kings], “good fortune, supporters, days, happiness, etc.” [to others].



In both pre-Islamic and Islamic times rules prescribed the wordings of prayers for men of different ranks and classes. Under the Pahlavi dynasty, epistolary prayers fell into disuse except among old-fashioned people and 'olamā', but after the revolution of 1357 Š./1979 they reappeared in official letters and communications to the media.

Best-known names. Before the use of a first name and a European-type surname became compulsory in 1304 Š./1925, a theologian, poet, mystic, or statesman was identified by his full name, which might have as many as four components: 1. the personal name and patronymic(s); 2. an adjective (*nesba*) indicating connection with a town, village, tribe, sect, function, or craft; 3. the formal or informal designation and title including patronymics and epithets, or in the case of a poet, the *takallos*; 4, the best-known name, which was usually one of the other three. The full name of a dignitary or notable normally had two of these components, sometimes more. For example: Abū Maṣṣūr [*konya*] Jamāl-al-dīn [Islamic title] Āyatallāh [personal designation] Ḥasan [name] b. Yūsof b. Moṭāḥhar [patronymics] Ḥellī [*nesba* to a city] *ma'rūf be* ("known as") 'Allāma [his best-known name among the Emāmī Shi'ites] or Ebn-e Moṭāḥhar [his best-known name among the Sunnis].

Since it often happens that the same person is mentioned under different titles or designations, and that the same title or *konya* belonged to different persons, selection of the most easily recognizable name, particularly for men of the Qajar period, is a difficult task. The Tehran Library services center works on the best-known name principle and has compiled an annotated index of names of historically famous persons and writers. The suggestion that such persons should be identified by a family name, which would most often be an urban or tribal *nesba*, seems of doubtful value.

The most important sources are works on letter writing (*tarassol*) and collections of letters (*monšā'āt*). For MSS., see Monzavī, *Noskahā* III, pp. 2083-123, and M. T. Dānešpažūh, "Dabīrī o nevīsandagī," *Honar o mardom* 114-18, 1351 Š./1972.

Especially important among MSS. are *Resāla-ye šāḥebīya* (Il-khanid period), Tehran, Malek Library, 3697; and Moḥammad b. Zayn-al-'ābedīn Noṣayrī (Safavid period), *Dastūr-e šahrīārān*, British Museum, MS. Or. 2941.

Important printed works on *tarassol* include Moḥammad b. 'Abd-al-Ḳāleq Mayhanī (6th/12th cent.), *Dastūr-e dabīrī*, ed. A. S. Erzi, Ankara, 1962.



Moḥammad b. Hendūšāh Nakĵavānī (8th/14th cent.), *Dostūr al-kāteb fī ta'yīn al-marāteb*, ed.

'A. 'Alīzāda, Moscow, 1964, 1971, 1976.

Qalqašandī (9th/15th cent.), *Sobḥ al-a'sā fī šenā'at al-enšā'* V-VI, Cairo, 1915 (the most thorough treatment).

Ḥasan b. 'Abd-al-Mo'men Kū'ī (9th/15th cent.), *Gonyat al-kāteb wa monyat al-ṭāleb* [and] *Rosūm al-rasā'el wa nojūm al-fazā'el*, ed. A. S. Erzi, Ankara, 1963.

Mollā Ḥosayn Wā'eẓ Kāšefī, *Šaḥīfa-ye šāhī*, Kanpur, 1295/1878.

For the Safavid period, see *Taḍkerat al-molūk* as well as *Dostūr al-molūk*, ed.

M. T. Dānešpažūh, supplement to *MDAT* 16/5-6, 1347-48 Š./1968-69.

For works on coins and seals, see the bibliography under Alqāb.

Collections of firmans, chancellery correspondence, *waqf* documents, and inscriptions provide an important source for 'anāwīn; S. 'A. Mo'ayyad Ṭābetī, *Asnād va nāmahā-ye tāriḳī az awā'el-e dawrahā-ye eslāmī tā awāker-e 'ahd-e Šāh Esmā'īl Šafawī*, Tehran, 1346 Š./1967.

'A. Navā'ī, *Asnād va mokātabāt-e tāriḳī-e Īrān az Tīmūr ta Šāh Esmā'īl*, Tehran, 1341 Š./1962.

J. Qā'em-maqāmī, *Yakṣad o panjāh sanad-e tāriḳī az Jalā'eriān tā Pahlavī*, Tehran, 1348 Š./1969.

Ḥ. Modarresī Ṭabāṭabā'ī, *Farmānhā-ye Torkamānān-e Qara Qoyunlū va Āq Qoyunlū*, Qom, 1352 Š./1973.

Ḍ. Ṭābetiān, *Asnād va nāmahā-ye tāriḳī-e dawra-ye Šafawīya*, Tehran, 1343 Š./1964.

'A. Navā'ī, *Šāh Esmā'īl Šafawī*, Tehran, 1347 Š./1968.

Idem, *Šāh Ṭahmāsb Šafawī*, Tehran, 1350 Š./1971.

Idem, *Šāh 'Abbās*, 2 vols., Tehran, 1352-53 Š./1973-74.

'A. Sepentā, *Tāriḳča-ye awqāf-e Ešfahān*, Isfahan, 1346 Š./1967.



M. Dabihī and M. Sotūda, *Az Āstārā tā Astārābād VI-VII*, Tehran, 1354 Š./1975.

E. Şafā'ī has published 8 vols. of documents from the Qajar period, including *Asnād-e siāsī-e dawrān-e Qājār*, Tehran, 1346 Š./1967, and *Panjāh nāma-ye tāriķī*, Tehran, 1350 Š./1971.

K. Eşfahānīān, *Majmū'a-ye asnād va madārek-e Farroḳ Kān Amīn-al-dawla*, 5 vols., Tehran, 1346-57 Š./1967-78.

Very important are the unpublished archives of the ministry of foreign affairs; see *Fehrest-e baḳṣī az asnād va 'ahd-nāmahā va safar-nāmahā va resālahā-ye dawra-ye Qājāriya*, Tehran, 1354 Š./1975.

For the 'anāwīn of scholars, poets, etc., see the works mentioned in the bibliography of Alqāb. For discussion of the best-known name, see M. Şabā, *Oşul-e fann-e ketābdārī va tanzīm-e ketāb-kānahā-ye 'omūmī va ḳoşuşī*, Tehran, 1333 Š./1954.

M. Amīr, "Şīva-ye şahiḳ-e zabṭ-e nām-e aşḳāş," *Āyanda* 7, 1360/1981, pp. 631-35.

N. Sharify, *Cataloging of Persian Works*, Chicago, 1959.

Institute for Research and Planning in Science and Higher Education, Tehran Book Processing Center, *The Name Authority List of Authors and Famous People I*, Tehran, 1977 (in Persian).

iii. Cities, States, and Institutions

Epithets reflecting the political, religious, or other significance of major cities are often found on coins and official documents, and in historico-geographical works and dictionaries. Since towns had traditionally served as centers of administration, their political epithets were often constructs with *dār* (house, seat) and words such as *salṭana*, *emāra*, and *ḳelāfa*. An early example is *dār-al-ḳelāfa*, which at first referred only to a part of Baghdad, but later became the epithet of the entire city. Still later it was applied to major capitals such as Tehran and Shahjahanabad (A. Aşraf, "Viżagihā-ye tāriķī-e şahr-neşīnī dar Īrān: dawra-ye eslāmī," *Nāma-ye 'olūm-e eĵtemā'ī* 1/3, 1353 Š./1974, pp. 7-49; Moqaddasī, p. 47). Similarly terms such as *dār-al-emāra*, *dār-al-dawla* (Sīstān under the Saffarids and the Taherids; Kermānşāhān under the Qajars), *dār-al-molk* (Marv, Balk, Herat, Ṭūs, Bokhara, Farḡāna, Nīşābūr), and *dār-al-salṭana*, which became particularly common after the 7th/13th century, were used to



characterize the urban centers in which the central government was located. Other terms such as *omm-al-qorā*, *omm-al-boldān*, and *omm-al-belād* were also common (Abu'l-Ḥasan Zayd Bayhaqī, *Tārīk-e Bayhaq*, ed. A. Bahmanyār, Tehran, 1317 Š./1938, p. 32; *Nozhat al-qolūb*, ed. M. Dabīrsiāqī, Tehran, 1336 Š./1957, pp. 11, 31, 181). The use of descriptive epithets became particularly popular under the Safavids; the trend continued down to the end of the Qajar period, even though some cities had already lost the characteristics that the epithets were supposed to reflect. Thus *dar-al-saltāna* was the epithet of such cities as Samarqand, Bokhara, Tabrīz, Herat, Shiraz, Qazvīn, Isfahan, Lahur, Kabul, Šamākī, Burhanpur, and Tehran. The Safavids called their capital *maqarr-al-saltāna*, while *dār-al-saltāna* was reserved for a town containing a royal palace (e.g., Ašraf and Faraḥābād in Māzandarān). Other appellations of note are *dār-al-marz* (for the provinces of Gīlān, Māzandarān, and Astarābād), *dār-al-żarb* (for a mint town), and the unique *dār-al-wezāra*, which is mentioned for Semnān in the 10th/16th century (Gardīzī, ed. Ḥabībī, pp. 93-98; *Nozhat al-qolūb*, pp. 11, 31, 34, 136, 181; *Tārīk-e Sīstān*, pp. 354, 403; Kvandmīr, *Dostūr al-wozarā'*, ed. S. Nafīsī, Tehran, 1317 Š./1938, pp. 35, 249, 355, 337, 380; Ḥ. Modarresī Ṭabāṭabā'ī, *Farmānhā-ye Torkamānān-e Qara Qoyunlū va Āq Qoyunlū*, Qom, 1352 Š./1973, p. 28; 'Abd-al-Nabī Faqr-al-zamānī Qazvīnī, *Tadkera-ye may-kāna*, ed. A. Goļčīn-e Ma'ānī, Tehran, 1340 Š./1961, pp. 202, 437, 494, 662. *Abbās-nāma*, ed. E. Dehgān, Arāk, 1329 Š./1950, pp. 48, 67, 103, 161, 173, 267; Eskandar Beg, pp. 296-97, 1086-93; Moḥammad Ja'far Kormūjī, *Ḥaqā'eḡ al-aḡbār-e Nāşeri*, ed. Ḥ. Kaḡiv Jām, Tehran, 1344 Š./1965, pp. 266, 283-85, 292, 300; E'temād-al-saltāna, *al-Ma'āter wa'l-āṭār*, Tehran, 1307/1889, pp. 30-35; "Alqāb-e belād-e eslāmī," *Yādgar* 4/8, pp. 71-75; H. L. Rabino, *Coins, Medals, and Seals of the Shahs of Iran: 1500-1941*, London, 1945, pp. 97-98).

A town could receive religious epithets when it contained a shrine, was a center of religious learning, or had a population where religious disposition was well-known. In the first case the epithet might be a simple adjective (Najaf-e Ašraf, Karbalā-ye Mo'allā, Makka-ye Mo'azzama), or a metaphor ('Atabāt-e 'Alīāt for the shrines in southern Iraq, Āstān-e Qods-e Rażawī for Mašhad, Balada-ye Ṭayyeba and Āstāna-ye Moqaddasa for Qom, etc.). In the second and third cases the epithets are often constructs, such as *dār-al-elm* (Shiraz and Bokhara), *dār-al-faẓl* or *afāzel* (Shiraz and Samarqand), *dār-al-ersād* (Ardabīl), *dār-al-īmān* (Qom and Kāšān), *dār-al-'ebāda* (Yazd), *dār- or baladat-al-mowaḥḡedīn* (Qazvīn), *qobbat-al-eslām* (Balk and Shiraz), etc. (*Nozhat al-qolūb*, p. 136; *Dostūr al-wozarā'*, pp. 356, 378, 449; *Tadkera-ye may-kāna*, pp. 329, 363, 414, 415, 662, 693, 868, 880; Eskandar Beg, pp. 276, 296, 305,



352, 354, 494, 1086-89; *‘Abbās-nāma*, pp. 32, 34, 63, 84, 109, 216, 263, 264; Abu'l-Ḥasan Golestāna, *Moǧmal al-tawārīk*, ed. M. Rażawī, Tehran 2536/1977, pp. 20, 30, 31, 39, 51, 485; Ḥāǧǧ Zayn-al-‘ābedīn Šīrvānī, *Rīāz al-sīāḥa*, Moscow, 1974, II, p. 10; Kormūǧī, *Ḥaqā’eq al-aḵbār-e Nāşerī*, pp. 121, 266, 298, 309, 312, 313; E’temād-al-salṭana, *al-Ma’āter wa’l-āṭār*, pp. 33-35, 58, 80; Rabino, *Coins*, pp. 97-98).

Descriptive epithets, often of a complimentary type, were popular during the Safavid and Qajar periods; they often rhymed with the name of the town (e.g., Šīrāz-e Jennat-ṭerāz). The following are some of the more popular names: *dār-al-amān*: Kermān, Multan; *dār-al-amn*: Sirhind; *dār-al-fath*: Astarābād; *dār-al-jeḥād*: Hyderabad; *bāb-al-jeḥenna*: Qazvīn; *dār-al-noşra*: Istanbul, Herat, and Sīstān; *dār-al-qarār*: Qandahār; *dār-al-sa’āda*: Astarābā, Zanǧān; *dār-al-şafā’*: Koy; *dār-al-sorūr*: Nīşābūr, Borūǧerd; *neşf-e jahān*: Isfahan (*Tārīk-e Bayhaq*, p. 20; *Dostūr al-wozarā’*, pp. 34, 378, 435; Eskandar Beg, pp. 305, 354; *Tadkera-ye maykāna*, pp. 429, 457, 545, 787, 892, 895; *Ḥaqā’eq al-aḵbār*, pp. 125, 258, 300; *al-Ma’āter*, pp. 33-35, 61; Rabino, *Coins*, pp. 97-98).

Countries and governments were also characterized by certain appellations. Iran was referred to as *mamlakat* or *mamālek-e moḥrūsa-ye Īrān* or *Īrān-zamīn*. Epithets used in official documents were *‘alīya* for Iran and the Ottoman empire; *bahīyya* for Iran, Russia, France, and other European royal states; and *fakīma* for Great Britain (K. Eşfahānīān, *Asnād va madārek-e Farroḵ Kān Amīn-al-dawla* IV, Tehran, 1354 Š./1975, p. 229; Kormūǧī, *Ḥaqā’eq al-aḵbār*, pp. 150, 155, 287, 224, 228; E’temād-al-salṭana, *Tārīk-e montazam-e Nāşerī*, Tehran, 1300/1883, pp. 128, 182, 189; Rabino, *Coins*, pp. 97-98).

The use of epithets, sometimes rhymed, to characterize institutions and edifices was also popular in the Qajar era. The most common terms were derivatives of the word *baraka* (blessing): *‘Emārat-e Mobāraka-ye Solṭānī*, *Telgerāf-kāna-ye Mobāraka*, *Madrassa-ye Mobāraka-ye Dār-al-fonūn*, *Meydān-e Mobāraka-ye Tūpḵāna*, etc. Terms derived from *naşr*, *zafar*, and *qahr* were used to describe the armed forces: *‘asāker-e manşūra*, *qoşūn-e zafar-nomūn*, *afwāǧ-e qāhera*, etc. The adjective *ǧalīla* was used for ministries and high offices: *Wezārat-e ǧalīla* or *Ḥokūmat-e ǧalīla-ye Dār-al-ḵelāfa*. Important buildings included *Kūşk-e Şāḥebqerānīya* or *‘Emārat-e Şams-al-‘emāra* (E’temād-al-salṭana, *al-Ma’āter*, pp. 38, 42, 44, 52, 59, 64, 65, 73, 79, 81; supplement, pp. 6, 12, 19, 26, 29, 32, 45, 46, 52, 67; cf. Qalqāşandī, *Sobḥ al-aşā* VI, Cairo, 1915, pp. 183-88).



Given in the text.