

detailed account of the dynasties, including their activities in Tihāma, can be found. The Ayyūbid conquest brought a swift end to the Mahdids, and the Yemen province of the empire centred in Egypt was created. The Ayyūbids in just 57 years brought peace and stability by force to the southern highlands and Tihāma. Their successors, the Rasūlids, were able to build on the hard-won military conquests of the Ayyūbids to form a southern Yemen and Tihāma of unparalleled political stability and administrative and intellectual development. Zabīd became an educational and religious centre of tremendous importance in the Yemen and its fame spread far and wide throughout the Islamic world. Particularly under the Rasūlids' successors, the Ṭāhirids (858-923/1454-1517 [q.v.]), the town assumed political importance also, for the Ṭāhirid court moved from the southern highlands to Zabīd each year when it became the winter capital. Little is heard of Tihāma for some two centuries. When we read the detailed account of much of Tihāma written by Niebuhr (*Voyage en Arabie*, etc., Amsterdam and Utrecht 1776, i, 235-96), the lone survivor of the 18th-century Danish expedition, it is clear that the real heyday of the area had long passed. Thereafter, in fact, the region became a rather loose appendage of Zaydī authority centred in the northern highlands of the Yemen.

2. *Geography and agriculture.* Despite its oppressive climate (temperatures up to 45° C and a relative humidity of 70-90% in summer), Tihāma, approximately 30-60 km/48-160 miles wide, with its several wadis in which flood water runs down from the mountains westwards, is a major agricultural area. The important wadis are, from north to south, Wādī Ḥarāḍ, Mawr, Surdud, Sahām and Rima'. The main agricultural products are cotton, sorghum, millet, sesame, watermelon, mango, banana, okra and tomato.

Bibliography: Ibn al-Mudjāwir, *Ta'riḫ al-Musabṣir*, ed. O. Löfgren, Leiden 1951-4, esp. 58-91; Francine Stone (ed.), *Studies on the Tihāmah*, Harlow 1985, *passim* (on the whole an excellent study, see G.R. Smith, *Studies on the Tihāmah*, in *JRAS*, 1986/1, 30-40, a review article); Smith, *The political history of the Islamic Yemen down to the first Turkish invasion (1-945/622-1538)*, in W. Daum (ed.), *Yemen: 3000 years of art and civilisation in Arabia Felix*, Innsbruck and Frankfurt [1988], 129-40; Francine Stone, art. *Tihāma*, in Aḥmad Ḍjābir 'Aḥf' alī, *al-Mawsū'a al-Yamaniyya*, i, Ṣan'a' 1992, 286-9.

(G.R. SMITH)

AL-TIHĀMĪ, ABU 'L-HASAN 'ALĪ B. MUḤAMMAD (d. 416/1025), Arab poet. His *nisba* points to the Tihāma [q.v.], the coastal plain on the Red Sea coast of Arabia, or to Mecca, which is sometimes synecdochically called "Tihāma". Ibn Kḥallikān (iii, 381) admits his ignorance as to which of these two locations is intended. He is said to have come from the lower classes (*min al-sūka*, al-Bākhharzī, i, 188-9). The poet spent most of his life in Syria, where he attached himself in particular to the Ḍjarrāhidīs [q.v.], who tried, with limited success, to consolidate their little principality in Palestine, with al-Ramla as its centre. It is probably on their behalf that he was appointed, at an unspecified date, *khatīb* of al-Ramla. In 416/1025 he served as a secret messenger of the Ḍjarrāhid prince Ḥassān b. Mufarridj to the Banū Qurra Bedouins in Egypt, who had already a history of revolt against the Fātimids, but was intercepted, identified as al-Tihāmī, locked up in the Cairene Flag Arsenal jail (*khiḏānat al-bunūd*) on 25 Rabī' II/6 July 1025 and unceremoniously killed there on 9 Ḍjumādā I/19 July

of the same year. The nature of Ḥassān's scheme is not spelled out.

Al-Tihāmī's poetry was collected into a small *diwān* which, according to Ibn Kḥallikān (iii, 379), consisted mostly of "selecutions" (*nukḥab*). This is not clearly borne out by the existing editions of the *Diwān*. Al-Bākhharzī (i, 188) characterises al-Tihāmī's poetry as "more delicate than the religion of a sinner and more tender than the tears of a lover" (*adakku min ḏini 'l-fāsiḫ—wa-arakku min dam'i 'l-'aṣḥik*).

As for genres, the lion's share is taken up by panegyrics. Among his more than thirty *mamdūḥs* we find princes of the various Bedouin dynasties that had sprung up at the time: the 'Uḳaylid Kīrwāsh (d. 391/1001; three poems, 66-8, 130-7, 283-7), the Ḍjarrāhidīs Mufarridj b. Daḡfal (d. 404/1013; four poems, 62-6, 218-25, 324-30, 360-6) and his son Ḥassān (d. after 433/1041-2; three poems, 240-50, 262-6, 375-82), and also the Kurdish Marwānid Naṣr al-Dawla Abū Naṣr Aḥmad b. Marwān (d. 401/1011 [see NAṢR AL-DAWLA]; one poem, 333-50). The others are lesser luminaries: viziers (among them al-Wazīr al-Maghribī [q.v.], 82-96), *kādīs*, *kātibs*, and one fellow-poet, one Abū 'Alī Ibn Nāfi' al-Ramlī (138-40). Other genres are poorly represented. Of note are four *siḏḡniyyāt*, written during his arrest in Cairo (104-12, 311-14, 424-7, 429-31) and three dirges written on the death of his little son (461-73 [inc. the three lines on 477], 478-86, 490-1). The first of these, some ninety lines in *kāmīl* with the rhyme -ānī, is the most famous of his poems, often quoted or alluded to, and still well known at the present time (see 'Aṭawī's introd. to his ed. of the *Diwān*, 5, and Brockelmann (see *Bibl.*) on an early modern commentary on it by Maḥmūd al-Sharīf).

Bibliography: The *Diwān* has not yet been critically edited, although the number of extant mss. is quite considerable, see Sezgin, *GAS*, ii, 478-9. The ed. Alexandria 1893 (not seen) is clearly the only basis of that of Muḥ. Zuhayr al-Shāwīsh, Damascus 1384/1964, as well as that of 'Alī Naḍjīb 'Aṭawī, Beirut 1986 (quoted in the article).—Biographical and anthological sources. *Tha'ālibī*, *Tatimmat al-Ya'īma*, ed. Mufid Muḥammad Kamīha, Beirut 1403/1983, 48-53; Ibn Bassām, *al-Dḥakhīra*, ed. Iḥsān 'Abbās, iv/2, Beirut 1399/1979, 537-49; Bākhharzī, *Dumyat al-ḳaṣr*, ed. Sāmī Makkī al-'Anī, i, Baghdād 1390/1970, 188-99; Ibn Kḥallikān, *Wafayāt*, ed. 'Abbās, iii, 378-81; Brockelmann, *S I*, 147; Kaḥḥāla, iii, 278, vii, 219.

(W.P. HEINRICHS)

TIHRĀN, the name of two places in Persia.

- I. Tīhrān, a city of northern Persia.
 1. Geographical position.
 2. History to 1926.
 3. The growth of Tīhrān.
 - (a) To ca. 1870.
 - (b) Urbanisation, monuments, cultural and socio-economic life until the time of the Pahlavis.
 - (c) Since the advent of the Pahlavis.
- II. Tīhrān, the former name of a village or small town in the modern province of Iṣfahān.

I. Tīhrān, older form (in use until the earlier 20th century) Tīhrān (Yākūt, *Buldān*, ed. Beirut, iv, 51, gives both forms, with Tīhrān as the head word; al-Sam'ānī, *Ansāb*, ed. Ḥaydarābād, ix, 103-7, had given only the form al-Tīhrānī), conventional European renderings Tehran, Teheran/Téheran, etc., a city of northern Persia, a town of only moderate size and fame in earlier Islamic times, but since the end of

the 18th century the capital city of Persia (modern Iran). For speculations on the etymology of the name (none of them convincing), see Minorsky's *ET* art. *Tehran*, at the beginning.

1. Geographical position.

It lies in lat. 35° 40' N., long. 51° 26' E. at an altitude of 1,158 m/3,800 feet, in a depression (*gawd*) to the south of the outer, southern spurs of the Elburz range [see ALBURZ], with the fertile Warāmīn [*q.v.*] plain, traditionally the granary of Tihṛān, stretching southwards from the town's centre. To the east of the plain, a southern spur of the Elburz chain, the *Sh*h *pāya* "tripod", forms a low barrier, and at the southern end of this lies the little town of Shāh 'Abd al-'Azīm [*q.v.*]. The ruins of the great pre-Islamic and mediaeval Islamic city of Rhages or Rayy lie between Shāh 'Abd al-'Azīm and the historic centre of Tihṛān [see AL-RAYY]. The villages on the Elburz slopes to the north of Tihṛān, such as Kūlhak (Golhak), Taḍjīrīsh and Shāmīrān, have traditionally provided summer retreats for the people of Tihṛān, avoiding the summer heat which forms part of the town's continental climate; and in the 19th century Shāmīrān also provided Tihṛān's water supply (and supplies much of it today), by means of subterranean channels (*kanāts* [*q.v.*], *kānīz*). All these settlements, once separate, are now however within the vast urban sprawl of contemporary Tihṛān (see below, section 3b).

For all its undeniable strategic position in the corridor connecting western Persia with Khurāsān, Tihṛān's geographical position is not obviously one for a capital city; other cities of Persia, in the western highland region and south of the great central deserts, have had much more significant roles in political and military affairs and in the economic and commercial life of the country. Certainly, the choice of the hitherto undistinguished town of Tihṛān by Agha Muḥammad Khān in 1200/1786 as his capital (see below, section 2), in order that he might be in close touch with the Kādjārs' Turkmen tribal followers in the Māzandarān-Gurgān plains region, did not immediately improve either the status or the amenities of the town. All early Western travellers describe early Kādjār Tihṛān as mean and insignificant, lacking in public buildings, with a poor water supply, and extreme climate and an eccentric position in regard to the main roads crossing northern Persia. In any case, centrifugal forces in the country, and the ancient traditions of provincial autonomy, were still strong at this time. Only towards the middle of the 19th century did Tihṛān's position improve. With regard to communications, for connections with Māzandarān and the Caspian coast a road passable only by horses and mules was built by the Austrian engineer Gasteiger Khān in 1875. Between 1883 and 1892 a carriage road was begun by the Persians and finally finished by the English company of Lynch Brothers (150 km/95 miles). Communication with Russia used to be by Kazwīn-Tabriz-Djulfā-Tiflis. In 1850 a regular line by Russian steamers began to run between Bākū and Anzālī. Although, as the crow flies, the distance between Tehran and the Caspian is only 110 km/70 miles, the passage of the Alburz was always very difficult. In 1893 the Russians obtained the concession to build a carriage road from Rašt to the capital (it was opened as far as Mandjil on 1 January 1890 and to Tihṛān on 15 September 1899). Henceforth, the great majority of travellers took this route, which also became of considerable commercial importance. Only in the 20th century did Tihṛān acquire the usual modern transport services by means

of motor roads, airlines and railways (see below, section 3b).

Bibliography: Naval Intelligence, Admiralty Handbooks, *Persia*, London 1945, 39, 538-40 and index; *Camb. hist. of Iran*, i, 445-61; W.C. Brice, *A systematic regional geography. VIII. South-West Asia*, London 1966, index; W.B. Fisher, *The geography of the Middle East*, London 1978, 318-20.

(C.E. BOSWORTH)

2. History to 1926.

It is uncertain when the name Tihṛān first appears in geographical and historical literature. De Goeje, in his edition of al-Iṣṭakhṛī, 209 n. k, proposed to identify with Tihṛān the B.h.zān, B.h.tān or B.h.nān mentioned by al-Iṣṭakhṛī, *loc. cit.*; Ibn Hawkal, ed. Kramers, 379, tr. Kramers-Wiet, 369; and al-Muḥaddasī, 375. But according to Yākūt, *Buldān*, ed. Beirut, i, 515 (although late and not very explicit), the place Bihzān, which represented the old site of Rayy, lay 7 *farsakhs* (?) from this latter town, while the same geographer places Tihṛān, as one would expect, one *farsakh* from Rayy. The earliest reference to Tihṛān is provisionally that of Ibn al-Balkhī's *Fārs-nāma*, ed. Le Strange, 134 (written before 510/1116); its author talks highly of the pomegranates of Tihṛān, also mentioned by al-Sam'ānī (in 555/1160), ix, 103. But independently of these references, the village of Tihṛān must have existed before the time of Iṣṭakhṛī (in 340/951-2), for al-Sam'ānī mentions his ancestor Abū 'Abd Allāh Muḥammad b. Hammād al-Tihṛānī al-Rāzī, who died at 'Askalān in Palestine in 261/874. According to Rāwandī's *Rāhat al-sudūr* (written in 599/1202), ed. Iqbāl, 293, in 561/1166, the mother of the Salḍjūk Sultan Arslān, who was on her way from Rayy to Nakhṛīwān, made the first stop (the regular *naḵṛī-makām* of the Persians) "near Tihṛān". The sultan himself occasionally stayed near Dūlāb (the name of a place to the south-east of Tihṛān, where the Russian cemetery now is). Ibn Isfandiyār in his history of Tabaristān (written in 613/1216; abridged tr. Browne, 19), narrating the wars of the kings of the Persian epic, says that Afrasiyāb's camp was pitched at the place where "Dūlāb and Tihṛān" now are. Eight years later, Yākūt gave a brief note on Tihṛān which he had visited just before the Mongol invasion. It was a considerable town, with 12 quarters. As the dwelling-houses in Tihṛān were built underground, and the gardens around the town had very dense vegetation, the town was well protected and the government in its dealings with the inhabitants preferred to be tactful with them. Civil discord raged to such an extent in Tihṛān that the inhabitants tilled their fields with the spade out of fear lest their neighbours should steal their animals. Zakariyyā' al-Ḳazwīnī (674/1275) compares the dwellinghouses in Tihṛān to the holes of jerboas (*ka-nāfīkā'i 'l-yarbū'*), and confirms Yākūt's account of the character of the inhabitants; cf. his *Āthār al-bilād*, ed. Wüstenfeld, 228.

All later writers note the subterranean dwellings, but only Ker Porter (*Travels*, i, 312) says in this connection that 200-300 yards from the Kazwīn gate he saw inside the town "an open space full of wide and deep excavations or rather pits", which served as shelters for the poor and stables for the beasts of burden (cf. pl. 57 in Hommaire de Hell, *Voyage*). This must be a reference to the old *darwāza-yi naw* (*pā-kāpuk*), to the south of which the quarter is called Ghār ("caves"). This name was also applied to the whole district stretching to the south of Tihṛān. As to the troglodyte life in the vicinity of Tihṛān, see Eastwick, *Journal*, i, 294: a village to the east of the

bridge of Karadj, and Crawshaw-Williams, *Rock-dwellings at Rainah*, in *JRAS* (1904), 551, (1906), 217.

The growth of Tihṛān was the result of the disappearance of other large centres in the neighbourhood. The decline of Rayy dates from its destruction by the Mongols in 617/1220. In the Mongol period, Tihṛān is occasionally mentioned in the *Djāmi' al-Tawārikh*: in 683/1284, Arghūn, after the victory gained near Ak-Kh'ādja (= Sūmīkān, see Hamd Allāh Mustawfī, *Nuzhat al-kulūb*, ed. Le Strange, 173) over al-Yanaq, Ahmad Takūdār's general, arrived at "Tihṛān of Rayy" (see Muḥammad Ḳazwīnī, *Tihṛān*, 38). In 694/1294 Ghāzān, coming from Fīrūzkūh, stopped at "Tihṛān of Rayy" (Dorn, *Auszüge*, 138). According to the *Nuzhat al-kulūb* (written in 740/1340; 55), Tihṛān was a considerable town (*mu'tabir*), with a better climate than Rayy. Formerly (*mā ḳabl*), the inhabitants of Tihṛān were very numerous. The last remark may support the hypothesis of the identity of Tihṛān with B.h.zān (?).

In the Tīmūrid period, the village of "Tihṛān of Rayy" is mentioned in 806/1403 as the place where the Shāh-zāde Rustam spent 20 days to assemble the troops with whom he marched against Iskandar-Shaykh Čalāwī (Sharaf al-Dīn Yazdī, *Ẓafar-nāma*, ii, 572 = 'Abd al-Razzāk Samarkandī, *Maṭla' al-sa'dayn*; Dorn, *Auszüge*, 175). About the same time (6 July 1404), Tihṛān (*ciudad que ha nombre Teheran*) was visited for the first time by a European traveller, the Spanish Ambassador Clavijo (ed. St. Petersburg 1881, 186, tr. Le Strange, London 1928, 166). At this time, the province of Rayy was governed by Tīmūr's son-in-law, the Amīr Sulaymān-Shāh (Ẓafar-nāma, ii, 591; Clavijo, 189, 351; Zuleman or Cumalexa Mirassā). He lived in Warāmin (Vatami). The town of Rayy (Xahariprey) was not inhabited (*agora deshabitada*). In the tower of Tihṛān was a representative of the governor, and there was a house where the king stopped on his visits (*una posada onde el Señor suele estar quando allí venia*). Tihṛān had no walls.

The Šafawids. Under the Šafawids, the capital was moved in turn from Ardabīl to Tabrīz and then to Ḳazwīn and finally to Iṣfahān. The district of Rayy was no longer of great importance. There were only two towns of note in it: Warāmin, which after a brief spell of glory under Shāh Rukh had rapidly declined, and Tihṛān. According to Riḍā Kulī Khān (*Rawḍat al-safā-yi Nāsirī*), the first visits of the Šafawids to Tihṛān were due to the fact that their ancestor Sayyid Ḥamza was buried there near Shāh 'Abd al-'Azīm. The prosperity of the town dates from Ṭahmāsp I, who in 961/1554 built a bazaar in it and a wall (*bāra*) round it which, according to the *Ẓinat al-maḳjālīs*, was a *farsakh* in length (Šanī' al-Dawla, *Mir'āt al-buldān*: 6,000 *gām* "paces"). The wall had four gates and 114 towers, the number of the sūras of the Ḳur'ān (on each of the towers a sūra was inscribed). The figure of 114 towers is still given in Berezin's plan (1842). The material for the construction of the citadel was procured from the quarries of Čāl-i Maydān and Čāl-i Hišār, which have given their names to two quarters. Aḥmad Rāḍī, himself belonging to the district of Rayy, talks in laudatory terms of the incomparable abundance of the canals and gardens of Tihṛān and the delights of the plateau of Šhamīrān, and of the neighbouring district of Kand and Sulakān (ms. Bibl. Nat., Suppl. Pers., no. 357, fols. 436-67, the greater part of which is devoted to the great men of the old town of Rayy). According to the *Maḳjālīs al-mu'minin* of Nūr Allāh Shūshṭarī, the village of Sulaghān was founded by the celebrated Sayyid Muḥammad

Nūrbakhsh, founder of many religious movements, who died in 869/1464 [see NŪRBAKHSĪVIYYA].

In 985/1577, Tihṛān was the scene of the execution of Prince Mīrzā, whose enemies had accused him to Shāh Ismā'il II of aiming at the throne. In 998/1589 Shāh 'Abbās I, going against the Uzbek 'Abd al-Mu'min Khān, fell severely ill at Tihṛān (*Ālam-ārā*, 275, tr. R.M. Savory, *History of Shah 'Abbās the Great*, Boulder, Colo. 1978, ii, 589), which enabled the Uzbeks to seize Maṣḥhad. It is said that this gave Shāh 'Abbās a great dislike for Tihṛān. It is, however, from his time that the building of the palace of Čahār Bāgh dates, the site of which was later occupied by the present citadel (*ark*). Pietro della Valle visited Tihṛān in 1618 and found the town larger in area but with a smaller population than Kāshān. He calls it the "town of plane trees". At this time, a *beglerbegi* ("gran capo di provincia") lived in Tihṛān; his jurisdiction extended as far as Fīrūzkūh. In 1627 Sir Thomas Herbert estimated the number of houses in Tihṛān at 3,000.

The Afghāns. On the eve of the Afghān invasion, Shāh Ḥusayn Šafawī made a stay in Tihṛān and it was here that he received Dūrri Efendi, the ambassador of the Ottoman Sultan Aḥmed III [*q.v.*] (at the beginning of 1720; *Relation de Dourri Efendi*, Paris 1810). Here also was dismissed and blinded the grand vizier Faṭḥ 'Alī Khān l'timād al-Dawla ("Athemat" of the Europeans), which precipitated the debacle; see Krusinski (publ. by Du Cerceau), *Hist. des révolutions de Perse*, Paris 1742, i, 295. Shāh Ḥusayn only returned to Iṣfahān (1 June 1721; La Mamye Clairac, *Histoire de la Perse*, Paris 1750, i, 200) to lose his throne. Ṭahmāsp II made a stay in Tihṛān in August 1725, but, on the approach of the Afghāns, he fled to Māzandarān. European writers say that Tihṛān resisted and Aṣḥraf lost many men (Krusinski, *op. cit.*, 351; La Mamye Clairac, *op. cit.*, ii, 250; Hanway, *Historical account*, ii, 234). Some time afterwards, Tihṛān fell in spite of the feeble attempt by Faṭḥ 'Alī Khān Kādjār to relieve the town (see Olivier, *Voyage*, v, 89 and *Mir'āt al-buldān*). According to this last source, the *Darwāza-yi Dawla* and *Darwāza-yi Ark* gates date from this period, for the Afghāns everywhere showed themselves careful to secure the ways of retreat. The reference is, of course, to the old gates of those names.

After the defeat of Aṣḥraf at Mihmāndūst (6 Rabī' I 1141/20 September 1728), the Afghāns in Tihṛān put to death the notables and left for Iṣfahān. The inhabitants fell upon the impedimenta which they had left and, through negligence, a powder magazine was exploded (*Histoire de Nadir Chah*, tr. Jones, London 1770, 78). Aṣḥraf himself was soon driven out of Warāmin, and Shāh Ṭahmāsp II returned to Tihṛān.

Nādir Shāh. In 1154/1741, Nādir gave Tihṛān as a fief to his eldest son Riḍā Kulī Mīrzā, who had hitherto acted as ruler of all Persia. The nomination to Tihṛān was preliminary to the fall and blinding of the prince; see Jones, ii, 123; Hanway, ii, 357, 378; 'Abd al-Karīm, *Voyage de l'Inde à la Mekke*, ed. Langlès, Paris 1825, 93.

During the fighting among the successors of Nādir, 'Alī Shāh 'Ādil (1160/1747) took refuge in Tihṛān but was seized and blinded by Ibrāhīm's supporters (*Tā'rikh-i bā'd-i Nādirīyya*, ed. O. Mann, 34). After the fall of the Nādirids, Tihṛān passed into the sphere of influence of the Kādjārs, rivals of Karīm Khān Zand.

Karīm Khān. In 1171/1757-8, Sultan Muḥammad Ḥasan Khān Kādjār, after an unsuccessful battle with Karīm Khān near Shirāz, retired to Tihṛān where his army was disbanded. Having learned that he had

withdrawn from Tihṛān, Karīm Khān sent his best general Shaykh 'Alī Khān there with an advance-guard. With the help of Muḥammad Khān Dawalū, Muḥammad Ḥasan Kādjar was killed and Karīm Khān with his army (*ordu*) arrived at Tihṛān in 1172/1759. The head of Muḥammad Ḥasan Khān was buried with all honour at Shāh 'Abd al-'Azīm. The next year, the order was given to build at Tihṛān a seat of government (*imārat*) "which would rival the palace of Chosroes at Ctesiphon", a *diwān-khāna*, a *haram* and quarters for the bodyguard; cf. Sādiq Nāmī, *Ta'rikh-i Giti-gushā*, Bibl. Nat., Suppl. Pers., no. 1374, fol. 29. Šanī' al-Dawla added to these buildings the Djannat garden, and he says that Karīm Khān intended to make Tihṛān his capital. It was to Tihṛān that Ākā Muḥammad Kādjar, captured in Māzandarān, was taken to Karīm Khān, who treated him generously, for which he was very badly requited later. In 1176/1762-3, however, Karīm Khān decided on Shīrāz, to which he moved the machinery of government. Ghafūr Khān was left as governor in Tihṛān.

The rise of the Kādjar's. Karīm Khān died on 13 Šafar 1193/2 March 1779. By 20 Šafar, Ākā Muḥammad was in Shāh 'Abd al-'Azīm, and the next day he ascended the throne (*du'lūs*) in the vicinity of Tihṛān (*Mir'āt*, i, 525). Tihṛān, however, passed into the sphere of influence of 'Alī Murād Khān, half-brother of Dja'far Khān Zand ('Alī Riḍā Shīrāzī, *Ta'rikh-i Zandīyya*, ed. E. Beer, Leiden 1888, 8, 13, 25). In 1197/1783, Ākā Muḥammad Khān made a first attempt to get possession of Tihṛān, but the governor Ghafūr Khān Tihṛānī managed to procrastinate, and an outbreak of plague forced Ākā Muḥammad to withdraw to Dāmghān (*Mir'āt*). After the death of 'Alī Murād Khān (1199/1785) the town was besieged by Ākā Muḥammad's troops. The inhabitants did not wish to surrender the fortress (*kal'a*) before Ākā Muḥammad had taken Isfahān. The news of the advance of Dja'far Khān Zand from Fārs caused Ākā Muḥammad's troops to disperse. He was, however, received with open arms by the chiefs of Tihṛān (*hākīm wa 'ummāl*) and henceforward the town was his capital (*makarr-i salṭanat*, *dār al-salṭana* and later *dār al-khūlāfa*), from which he led the expeditions which united all Persia under his rule. According to the *Mā'āthir-i sulṭānī*, tr. Sir Harford Jones Brydges, *Dynasty of the Kayars*, 18, Tihṛān became the capital in 1200/1786 and the foundations of the palace were laid then. After the capture of Shīrāz, all the artillery and munitions of the Zands were taken to the new capital. The last Zand ruler, Lutf 'Alī Khān, blinded and kept prisoner in Tihṛān, was put to death there in 1209/1794-5 and buried in the sanctuary of the *imām-zāde Zayd*; *ibid.*, 25, 30, 76, 82, 101.

After the assassination of Ākā Muḥammad Shāh (21 Dhu 'l-Hijja 1211/16 June 1797), his brother 'Alī Kulī Khān appeared before the capital, but the chief minister Mīrzā Šhafī' would not allow him to enter. In the meanwhile, the heir to the throne Bābā Khān (= Fath 'Alī Shāh) was able to reach Shīrāz, and after the defeat of the second claimant Sādiq Khān Shaḳāḳī, was crowned in mid-1212/2 the beginning of 1798. The Shaḳāḳī [*q.v.*] prisoners were employed to dig the ditch of the capital (cf. Schlechta-Wschehrd, *Fath 'Alī Shah und seine Thronrivalen*, in *Sitz. A.W. Wien* [1864] ii, 1-31).

During the period of Anglo-French rivalry, a series of ambassadors visited Tihṛān: on the one side Sir John Malcolm (1801 and 1810), Sir Harford Jones Brydges (1807), and Sir Gore Ouseley (1811), and on the French side, Gen. Romieu (d. at Tihṛān in 1806),

A. Jaubert (1806), and Gen. Gardane (1807). The Russians concentrated their efforts on Tabrīz, the residence of the Persian Crown Prince. It was only after the treaty of Turkmančay [*q.v.*] in 1828 that the Russian minister A.S. Griboedov paid a short visit to the capital. Just before his return to Tabrīz, Mīrzā Ya'qūb, one of the Shāh's chief eunuchs, an Armenian of Eriwān forcibly converted to Islam, presented himself at the Russian legation and asked to be repatriated by virtue of article 13 of the treaty.

This "apostasy" provoked an attack on the Russian embassy, and on 11 February 1829, 45 members of it were massacred (Griboedov, his secretaries, Cossacks and servants). The tragedy took place in the legation's quarters (house of the *zambūrakūbāshī* near the old Shāh 'Abd al-'Azīm gate; now the street called Sar-pūlak in the Zargarābād quarter). On the death of Griboedov, celebrated in the annals of Russian literature, see *sub anno* Riḍā Kulī Khān, *Rawdat al-safā-yi Nāširi*, Tihṛān 1274/1858; Mīrzā Taqī Khān, *Ta'rikh-i Kādjarīyya*, Tihṛān 1273/1857, i, 221; Šanī' al-Dawla, *Ta'rikh-i muntaẓam-i Nāširi*, iii, Tihṛān 1301/1883, 144; *Relation des évènements qui ont précédé et accompagné le massacre de la dernière ambassade russe en Perse*, in *Nouv. Annales des voyages* [1830], part 48, 337-67; Bergé, *Smert' Griboedova*, in *Russ. Starina* [1872], viii, 162-207; Malyshinsky, *Podlinnoye delo*, in *Russ. vestnik* [1890], vi, 160-233; Žukovski, *Persidskiye letopis'tsi*, in *Novoye Vremya* [1890], no. 5068; Allahverdiants, *Končina Griboedova po armianskim istočnikam*, in *Russ. Starina* [1901], no. 10, 44-68; V. Minorsky, "Tsena krovi" Griboedova, in *Russ. Misl.* (Prague 1923), iii, 1-15; D.P. Costello, *The murder of Griboedov*, in *Oxford Slavonic Papers*, viii [1958].

When the death of Fath 'Alī Shāh (19 October 1834) became known in the capital, his son 'Alī Mīrzā Zill-i Sulṭān proclaimed himself king under the name of 'Adil Shāh and struck coins. But the heir to the throne Muḥammad Mīrzā arrived from Tabrīz, accompanied by representatives of Britain and Russia, and entered the capital without striking a blow on 2 January 1835. 'Adil Shāh only reigned for six weeks (cf. Tornau, *Aus. d. neuesten Geschichte Persiens*, in *ZDMG* [1849], 1-15). The succession of the next three Shāhs took place without incident [see KĀZDĀR] (even after the assassination of Nāšir al-Dīn Shāh on 1 May 1896). The history of Tihṛān under these Shāhs is that of all Persia. The tranquillity of the town was only disturbed by epidemics and the periodical migrations caused by famine; cf. the rioting on 1 March 1861, described by Eastwick, *op. cit.*, and Ussher, *Journey from London to Persopolis*, London 1865, 625.

Among the more important events may be mentioned the persecution of the Bābīs [*q.v.*], especially in 1850 after the attempt on Nāšir al-Dīn Shāh's life. The movement against the concession of a tobacco monopoly to the Tobacco Monopoly Corporation in 1891 also started in Tihṛān; see E.G. Browne, *The Persian Revolution of 1905-1909*, Cambridge 1910, 46-57.

The Constitutional Revolution. After the Persian Revolution, the capital, previously somewhat isolated from the provinces, rapidly became the political and intellectual centre of this country. The chronology of the events of the period was as follows: The *bast* [*q.v.*] of the merchants in the *Masjīd-i Shāh*, December 1905. The *bast* of the constitutionalists at the British legation from 20 July to 5 August 1906. The opening of the Maḳjlīs in the palace of Bahārīstān on 7 October 1906. The heir to the throne Muḥammad 'Alī Mīrzā signs the constitution on 30 December 1906. Death of Muẓaffar al-Dīn Shāh on 8 January 1907. The assassination of the Atābeg Amīn al-Dawla

on 31 August 1907. Counter-manifestations by the "absolutists" from 13-19 December 1907. Bombardment of the *Madjilis* on 23 June 1908. Capture of Tihṛān by the nationalist troops commanded by the Sipahdār-i A'zam of Rasht and the Sardār-i As'ad Bakhtiyārī on 13-15 July 1909. Abdication of Muḥammad 'Alī Shāh on 16 July; accession of Sultan Aḥmad Shāh on 18 July 1909. See Browne, *The Persian Revolution*; D. Fraser, *Persia and Turkey in Revolt*, London 1910, 82-116; Vanessa A. Martin, *Islam and modernism. The Iranian revolution of 1906*, London 1989; and the *Bibls. of DUSTŪR*, iv, and *Elr*, art. *Constitutional Revolution*, ii (Vanessa Martin). On the events of 12 May 1911 to 11 January 1912, information can be found in Morgan Shuster, *The strangling of Persia*, London 1912. In 1915, Tihṛān became involved in the First World War. The representatives of the Central Powers nearly carried Aḥmad Shāh off to Kūm with them. The capital was outside of the zone of military operations proper, but on several occasions movements of troops took place in its vicinity (skirmish on 10 December 1915 near Rabāt-Karīm between Russian Cossacks and the Amīr Hishmat's gendarmes, who were on the side of the Central Powers; cf. Emelianov, *Persidskii front*, Berlin 1923). Down to 1917, Russian troops controlled the region between the Caspian and Tihṛān. From 1918 British troops took their place; cf. L.C. Dunsterville, *The adventures of Dunsterforce*, London 1920. The division of Persian Cossacks commanded by the old Russian instructors was also employed to protect Persia against a possible offensive from the north. The Russian officers were dismissed on 30 October 1920. The greater part of the division was stationed at Kaẓwīn, where a British force under General Ironside was still quartered. On 21 February 1921, 2,500 Persian Cossacks, who had come from Kaẓwīn under the command of their general Riḍā Khān, occupied the capital. Sayyid Ḍiyā' al-Dīn formed the new cabinet (24 February-24 May) and Riḍā Khān was appointed commander-in-chief (*Sardār Sipah*; cf. J.M. Balfour, *Recent happenings in Persia*, London 1922). Towards the end of 1923, Aḥmad Shāh left the country, at the same time as the prime minister Kawām al-Saltāna (from 4 June 1921), who was accused of intriguing against the Sardār Sipah. The latter remained master of the situation and was finally crowned on 25 April 1926 [see RĪDĀ SHĀH].

Bibliography: In addition to the Arabic and Persian sources quoted in the text, see 'Abd al-Rashīd Bākū'ī, *Talkhīs al-āthār*, in *Notices et extraits*, ii (1789), 477; Zayn al-'Abīdīn, *Bustān al-siyāhat*, Tihṛān 1315, 354; Hādīdjī Khalīfā, *Ḍjihān-numā*, Istanbul 1145/1732-3, 92; Ewliyā Ālebi, *Seyāhat-nāme*, iv, 382-3, s.v. Rey (not very accurate); Šanī' al-Dawla, *Mir'āt al-buldān*, Tihṛān 1294, i, 508-94 (an important compilation); Muḥammad Khān Kaẓwīnī, *Tihṛān*, in *Bīst maḳāla-yi Kaẓwīnī*, Bombay 1928, 36-9; *Kaveh* (1921), no. 2.

European works. Langlès, in his edition of Chardin, viii, Paris 1811, 162-70 [Chardin himself only mentions the name of "Théran, petite ville du pays Comisène", viii, 174]; Ritter, *Erkunde*, viii, Berlin 1838, 604-12; Le Strange, *The lands of the Eastern Caliphate*, Cambridge 1905, 217; Schwarz, *Iran im Mittelalter*, Leipzig 1926, 807.

Pietro della Valle (1618), *Viaggi*, Brighton 1843, i, 703 (parte II, lettera IV); Sir Thomas Herbert (1627), *Some Year's Travels*, 3rd ed. London 1677, 206; J. Hanway, *Historical account*, London 1754, i, 246 (in the itinerary of van Mierop); G.A. Olivier (1797), *Voyage*, Paris 1807, v, 87-94, vi, 47; J. Mal-

colm, *Sketches of Persia* (1807), London 1827, ii, 103-52, chs. xvii-xix; J. Macdonald Kinneir, *A geographical memoir on Persia*, London 1813, 118; A. Jaubert, *Voyage en Arménie et en Perse* (1806), Paris 1821, 221, 228, 233, 331-5; General Gardane, *Journal d'un voyage... en 1807 et 1808*, Paris 1809, 48, 55; A. Dupré, *Voyage* (1808), Paris 1819, ii, 186-94; Sir Harford Jones Brydges, *An account of the transactions of H.M.'s mission* (1807-11), London 1834, 185 ff.; J. Morier, *A journey through Persia* (1808-1809), London 1812, 185-97, 224; Sir Gore Ouseley, *Travels* (1811-1812), London 1823, iii, 115-200 and Atlas; W. Price, *Journal of the Brit. Embassy to Persia* (1811), 2nd ed., London 1832, 28-39, views of Tihṛān and Kaṣr-i Kādījār; Morier, *Second journey* (1810-1816), London 1818, chs. xi-xii, 169-99; R. Ker Porter, *Travels* (1817), London 1821, i, 306-65, general view from the south, p. 312; J.B. Fraser, *A winter's journey* (1838), London 1838, i, 416; Baron F. Korf, *Vospominaniya o Persii* (1834-5), St. Petersburg 1838, 197-261; Prince A. Soltykoff, *Voyage en Perse* (1838), Paris 1851, 85-115, view of the streets; Berezin, *Puteshestviye po Vostoku* (1842), Kazan 1852, ii, 143-77, with an important plan of Tihṛān and Ray; Hommaire de Hell, *Voyage* (1846-8), Paris 1856, ii, 115-213, and Atlas, Paris 1859, pls. 57-73; excellent views of Tihṛān, the palace, the Maydān-i Shāh, etc. by Laurents (cf. below, d'Allemagne); Lady Sheil, *Glimpses of... Persia* (1849), London 1856, 118 and *passim*; A. de Gobineau, *Trois ans en Asie* (1834), Paris, 175, 211-25; A.H. Mounsey, *A journey* (1865-6), London 1872, 127-47; E.B. Eastwick, *Journal* (1860-1), London 1864, i, 217-45 and *passim*; Brugsch, *Reise d. K. Preussischen Gesandtschaft* (1860-1), Leipzig 1865, i, 207-34 and *passim*, several coloured plates; J. Basset, *Persia* (1871-84), London 1886, 102-19; Mme. Serena, *Hommes et choses en Perse* (1877-8), Paris 1883, 48 ff.; E. Stack, *Six months in Persia*, London 1882, ii, 151-69; Orsolle, *Le Caucase et la Perse* (1882), Paris 1885, 210-94; S.G.W. Benjamin, *Persia and the Persians* (1883-5), London 1887, 56-108; G.N. Curzon, *Persia* (1889-90), London 1892, i, 300-53 (still the most important description); E.G. Browne, *A year amongst the Persians*, London 1893, 82-98; S.G. Wilson, *Persian life*², London 1896, 140-55; Feuvrier, *Trois ans à la cour de Perse* (1889-91), n.p. n.d., 126-219 (numerous illustrations); Sir A. Houtum-Schindler, *Teheran*, in *Encycl. Brit.*, 1911, 11th ed., xxvi, 506 (excellent résumé); H.R. d'Allemagne, *Du Khorasan...*, Paris 1911, iii, 215-68 and index; plan of the *Ark*, many illustrations (including several drawings by Laurents, 1848). See also H. Hirsch, *Téhéran*, Paris 1862; Forges, *Téhéran et la Perse en 1863*, in *Revue des deux mondes*, 15 mai 1864; G. Spasskii, *Ninešniū Teheran i ego okrestnosti*, in *Izv. Russ. Geogr. Obšč.* (1866), ii, 146; A. Vambéry, *Meine Wanderungen in Persien*, Pesth 1868, 106-23, 260; G.R.G. Hambly, *The traditional Iranian city in the Qajar period*, in *Camb. hist. Iran*, vii, 542 ff. See also the *Bibls. to ZAND and KĀDJĀR*.

(V. MINORSKY*)

3. The growth of Tihṛān.

(a) To ca. 1870.

Yāqūt's account of the houses of Tihṛān suggests that the oldest part of the town is in the south (the Ghār quarter) and that it developed from south to north (i.e. from the desert to the mountain and to the springs). There is little left in Tihṛān of the Zand period. The modern town has been entirely created under the Kādījārs. On its antecedents, see Chahriyar Adle, *Le jardin habité ou Téhéran de jadīs, des origines aux*

Safavides, in idem and B. Hourcade (eds.), *Téhéran capitale, bicentenaire*, Paris-Tehran 1992, 15-37.

Olivier, who visited Tihirān in 1796, says that the town, which looked entirely new or rebuilt, was in the form of a square of a little more than 2 miles (?), but only half of this was built upon. The population did not exceed 15,000, of whom 3,000 were soldiers, and Olivier remarks with justice that "the gold scattered around the throne" did not fail to attract inhabitants. The palace in the citadel was built in the time of Ākā Muḥammad Shāh. In the *Tālār-i takht-i marmar* were placed the pictures, glass and marble pillars taken from the palace of Karīm Khān in Shīrāz. Under the threshold of a door were buried the bones of Nādir Shāh so that the Kādjār prince could trample over them every day (Ouseley). On the accession of Riḍā Shāh, the bones were taken away.

According to General Gardane (1808), only the poor remained in Tihirān in summer, but in winter the population reached 50,000.

Morier (1808-9) says that Tihirān was 4½-5 miles in circumference. Kinnear, about the same time, put the summer population at 10,000 and the winter at 60,000. The town was surrounded by a strong wall and a great ditch with a glacis, but the defences were only of value in a country where "the art of war was unknown".

Ouseley (1811) counted 6 gates in Tihirān, 30 mosques and colleges and 300 baths; he put the population in winter at 40-60,000. Ker Porter (1817) mentions 8 (?) gates, before which large round towers were built (cf. his plan) to defend the approaches and control the exits. In winter, the population was from 60-70,000.

Fath 'Alī Shāh had considerably improved the town, but towards the end of his reign it passed through a period of neglect. According to Fraser (1838), there was not another town in Persia so poor-looking; "not a dome" was to be seen in it. Under Muḥammad Shāh, things were improved a little.

Berezin has given a particularly detailed description of the palace (*darb-i dawlat-khāna*) with its four courts and numerous buildings (Dawlat-khāna, Daftar-khāna, Kulāh-i firangī ["pavilion"], Sandūk-khāna, Zargar-khāna, 'Imārat-i Shīr-i Khurshīd, Sarwistān, Kḥalwat-i Shāh, Gulistān). The same traveller gives a plan of the palace and of the town, very important for the historical topography of Tihirān. At this date (1842), the town within its walls measured about 3,800 Persian *arshīn* (roughly yards) from west to east and 1,900-2,450 from north to south, i.e. occupied an area of about 3 square miles (J.E. Polak's calculation, in *Topogr. Bemerkungen z. Karte d. Umgebung und zu d. Plane v. Teheran*, in *Mitt. der K.K. Geogr. Gesell.*, xx [1877], Vienna 1878, 218-25 (with a map 1:108,000 and a plan of 1:20,700 made by Comm. Krziz in 1857-8), at p. 223, as 83,750 m² is obviously wrong). The citadel (*ark*) was in the shape of a parallelogram (600 *arshīn* west to east by 1,175 north to south, i.e. a fourth of the whole town). The north side of the *ark* touched the centre of the northern face of the outer wall. Gardens occupied the parts of the town next to the wall. The most animated quarter was that which lay to the south-east of the citadel in the direction of the Shāh 'Abd al-'Azīm gate. Only five gates are marked on this plan. The only open space, the Maydān-i Shāh close to the citadel on the south side, was not large (cf. the plate in Hommaire de Hell). Among the mosques, that of the Shāh and the *imām-zāda* of Zayd and Yaḥyā alone are of any importance. Gardane had seen the *Masjid-i Shāh* being

built in 1807. Its inscription, from the hand of the court calligrapher Muḥammad Maḥdī, is dated 1224/1809, but according to Schindler, the mosque was not finished till 1840 (cf. Fraser, above).

The plan by Krziz (publ. Tihirān 1857) much resembles that of Berezin, but around the town he marks by dotted lines the bounds of a new extension of the town, which according to an explanatory note by Dr. Polak, had been begun considerably before 1857. Polak himself in 1853 had built a hospital to the north of the north gate of the town. These new buildings were few in number and not built under any regular scheme. In 1861 the town was still within the old square; the population was 80,000 in summer and 120,000 in winter (Brugsch).

Bibliography: See the references listed in the *Bibl.* to section 2 above, and, for the last years of the period dealt with above, Mansourah Ettehadiéh, *Patterns in urban development: the growth of Tehran (1852-1903)*, in C.E. Bosworth and C. Hillenbrand (eds.), *Qajar Iran. Political, cultural and social change 1800-1925. Studies presented to Professor L.P. Elwell-Sutton*, Edinburgh 1983, 199 ff. (V. MINORSKY)

(b) Urbanisation, monuments, cultural and socio-economic life until the time of the Pahlavīs.

(i) *Urban development*

Despite the political role evolved by the Kādjārs, Tihirān retained the appearance of a traditional Persian Islamic township until the reign of Muḥammad Shāh (1834-48). Urban activity was centred *intra muros*, around the royal citadel of the Arg (or Ark) and the lanes of the Bāzār quarter, site of the ancient village of Tihirān, as far as the Shāh 'Abd al-'Azīm [*q.v.*] gate. Huge gardens were laid out in the very interior of the eastern quarters ('Awldādjān, Čāla Maydān) and the western (Sangilādāj). Besides the Arg, the town contained few large buildings. The only open public space was the small square, Maydān-i Shāh, between the Bāzār and the Arg, where the Russian legation was accommodated, while that of Great Britain was situated close to the Shāh 'Abd al-'Azīm gate (see Moghtader, 43, and Bérézine's plan from 1842-3 [Moscow 1852]; adapted and reprinted with captions by J. Calmard [1974], 124-6; redrawn, with quarters identified by Moghtader, extra-textual plate I).

Until the mid-19th century, the majority of European observers considered Tihirān a dismal township which, with its unhealthy climate, lack of water provision and dearth of prestigious monuments could never rival the ancient Persian capitals such as Tabrīz, Iṣfahān and Shīrāz, and could even be supplanted as capital by other sites of royal residence.

The real promotion of the city to the status of capital was owed to the initiatives of Naṣir al-Dīn Shāh (1848-96 [*q.v.*]). But transformation was very gradual. The Islamic town is still clearly visible in the plan drawn by Krziz, published in December 1858 (not in 1857) (partially inaccurate and incomplete document; see Gurney, 56, no. 21; redrawn by Moghtader, extra-textual plate II and Plan of the Arg according to Krziz, 45). This colour-coded map supplies abundant information on the nature of buildings (mosques, businesses, residences, gardens, etc.). It indicates a first step towards urbanisation, as is confirmed by the earliest register of houses (not a true census) made at the Shāh's behest by an anonymous individual in 1269/1852 (Ettehadiéh [1983], 200; *Āmār*, 37-345). The town is divided into five quarters (*maḥalla*): Ark, 'Awldādjān, Bāzār, Sangilādāj and Čāla Maydān. This document gives information on the social, commercial

and professional infrastructure of the quarters, especially regarding their socio-religious aspect. Buildings are divided between: houses (those of officials, *naukars*, those of subjects, *ra'āyās*, commoners and minorities); official edifices (palace or house in the service of the crown or of the civil service, *madrasas*, numerous *takyas* (Persian *tekyes*, communal places, primarily for the celebration of *Shīr'ī* mourning rituals); commercial premises (those that are in operation, those that are closed or abandoned). Each quarter is divided into *pātuk* (on this term, signifying primarily the place where *Shīr'ī* funereal flags are stored, see Calmard [1972], 36) and *gudhar* (passage). This register gives the names of the owners of buildings or of tenants, if the property is part of a *wakf*, etc. One section (336-45) relates to zones in the process of urbanisation beyond the five gates of the city.

The first projects of urbanisation, in the years 1851-2, related to the quarters of the Arg and the Bāzār and included the renovation of the public square, the Sabza Maydān, formerly the Maydān-i Shāh (Gurney, 52). But the sovereign was still intent on the construction of prestigious buildings *extra muros*, as is illustrated in particular by the erection, in 1856, of the first state-run *takya/tekye*, the Tekye Dawlatī of Niyāwarān which was to replace the *tekye* of Muḥammad Shāh's vizier Hādījīr Mīrzā Ākāsi (Calmard [1976-7 A], 157-162). The Shāh, the court and the nobility continued to flee the unhealthy atmosphere of the town, especially in the summer and in particular during the cholera epidemics which had afflicted Tihṙān since 1823 (see X. de Planhol, *Elr*, art. *Cholera. I. In Persia*). The diplomat Arthur de Gobineau, who spent two periods of time in Tihṙān (1855-8 and 1862-3), reckoned that one-third of the inhabitants of the city died of cholera in 1856 (*Trois ans en Asie*, Paris 1859, repr. Paris 1922, ii, 234). He noted, however, that in 1862, as a result of the Shāh's efforts, the city was embellished and "augmented by two substantial quarters"; the *bāzārs* were abolished and the majority of the ruins replaced by attractive buildings (A.D. Hytier, *Les dépêches diplomatiques du Comte de Gobineau en Perse*, Geneva-Paris 1959, letter dated 28 February 1862, 169).

However, during the 1850s, the city began to expand *extra muros*, as is shown by Polak's comments on another map of Tihṙān and its surroundings established by Krziz. This extension took place principally towards the north, mainly in the direction of the summer palaces. Garden suburbs (Bāgh-i Sardār and Nigāristān) flanked the road leading from the Shamirān Gate to the Kaṣr-i Kādjār. From the Dawlat Gate, another road led to this palace via the garden-boulevard of Lālazār. Alongside another road were situated military installations, "proto-industrial" premises, a new hospital, etc. (Gurney, 56-7). Affluent new buildings were located in these zones, as well as poorer ones to the south, near the clay quarries and the brickworks. As is also noted by Polak, the city itself was choked within its dilapidated walls, some quarters, such as that of Čāla Maydān, becoming unwholesome places to live (Moghtader, 44).

In the specific context of Kādjār Persia, the modernisation of Tihṙān required at the very least expansion, to be achieved by the destruction of the ancient walls. While the motivation and procedure of the project remain obscure, the decision was taken in December 1867, when Nāṣir al-Dīn Shāh had been in power for almost twenty years (Gurney, 51-2). Among the motives leading to this decision, the following have been evoked:

1. Demographic changes. According to a crit-

ical study of European testimony, the population of Tihṙān, during the summer months, had increased from 15,000 inhabitants in the 1790s to 100,000 at the beginning of the reign of Nāṣir al-Dīn Shāh (thesis of J. Brown, Durham 1965, quoted by Gurney, 54-5). Without supplying precise figures, the report of the census of 1269/1852-3 indicates urban development close to the gates: Muḥammadiyya and Shāh 'Abd al-'Azīm to the south; Shamirān to the north, in the extra-mural zones of Bāgh-i Sardār, properties of the Kalāntar, the Takht-i Khān, the Mahalla-yi Barbarihā and immigrants from Afghānistān (Gurney, 55).

Some fifteen years later, the report of the (incomplete) census of 'Abd al-Ghaffār (Nādjim al-Mulk, later Nādjim al-Dawla) compiled at the very beginning of the changes, in February 1868, shows an expansion of the quarters of Čāla Maydān and Sangilādj, to the detriment of the gardens, and in particular a significant increase in the number of extra-mural houses, where some 15% of the population then lived, including numerous immigrants. It was also there, in the residential zones to the north of the ancient wall, that the Europeans and their embassies were to be installed (Gurney, 56 ff.).

2. Security needs. The establishment of the new quarters, especially the affluent ones to the north, required protection, to be supplied by a ditch, a rampart and twelve new gates guarded day and night. This also provided the means to control the populace, in the event of threats of revolt, tribal raids and cholera epidemics, as well as facilitating the levying of taxes on merchandise (Gurney, 59).

3. Flooding and its consequences. The new needs of urbanisation also required the development of carriageable roads and provision of water. This was problematic since, besides earthquakes and epidemics, this city, being situated on the plain at the foot of a mountain range, was subject to flooding. The catastrophic flood of May 1867 caused much damage in the north, affecting the access road to the palace, the new quarters, the gardens, the summer residence of the Russian legation, etc., as well as numerous quarters and roads extending as far as the sanctuaries of Shāh 'Abd al-'Azīm. The network of *kanāts* [q.v.] supplying the city with water having also been damaged, and with a cholera epidemic claiming numerous victims in August, the Shāh, who had been making the pilgrimage to Mashhad, delayed his return to the city until mid-October. By this time, the ravages of the flood had been repaired and new architectural projects partially realised (see below). But the warning had been drastic.

4. Foreign influences. The introduction of new ideas and techniques, including photography, from the 1840s onward, the creation of the Dār al-Funūn (1851-2), where teaching was given by Europeans, the multiplication of contacts with Europe, especially through the creation of new embassies, were also factors of change. Besides the demolition of the ancient walls, the modernisation of Tihṙān was first imposed on the Arg quarter, to the north-east of which a large square was created, the Maydān-i Tūp-khāna, centre of the renovated capital. A new gate, Darwāza-yi Nāṣirī or Shams al-Imāra, breaching the wall of the Arg, and a new avenue (the future Khīyābān-i Nāṣirī) linked the citadel to the Bāzār. Among architectural projects realised during the 1860s, the Shams al-Imāra palace shows a European influence, as does the Bāgh-i Gulistān garden, transformed by a French gardener. As for the new rampart, it was designed by the French polytechnic engineer Alexandre Buhler, a teacher at

the Dār al-Funūn, on the model of the first system of fortifications of Vauban. The 1860s were the decade of modernisation of great capitals, including Istanbul and Cairo. Major architectural achievements were displayed at the prestigious universal exhibition held in Paris in 1867, where the moderniser of Egypt, Ismā'īl Pasha, was able to visit renovated Paris, guided by Baron Haussmann. This exhibition and the renovation of Paris influenced the urbanisation of Cairo, Istanbul and, indirectly, that of Tihṛān. The reformist Mīrzā Ḥusayn Khān Muṣṣḥir al-Dawla [see MUSHḤIR AL-DAWLA], ambassador of Persia in Istanbul, attempted to persuade Nāṣir al-Dīn Shāh to participate. Some Persians, including courtiers, had seen Paris and the exhibition. Photographs, paintings, engravings and other documents, sent to Tihṛān, showed the changes being undertaken in the major capitals. These diverse factors may have influenced the decision of the Shāh (Gurney, 64 ff.).

Solemnly proclaimed, the decision of December 1867 was not implemented by the reformer Muṣṣḥir al-Dawla and his supporters, who came to power in December 1870. Begun before and at the time of the floods of 1867 with the renovation of the Arg, the modernisation of the city (and dealing with the related problems of property ownership) was entrusted to conservative officials already in office: Mustawfī al-Mamālik, minister of finance, and Mīrzā 'Īsā, vizier of Tihṛān. Projects of expansion, the construction of a rampart (which had no military or defensive function) and of the twelve gates, lasted some four years, until 1288/1871-2 (Gurney, 53, 67 ff.). As is shown by the plan of 'Abd al-Ghaffār (published in 1892), the initial intention was to mark out the new quarters with rectilinear avenues flanked by trees and streams. The most prosperous quarter was the Maḥalla-yi Darwāza Dawlat, also called Dawlat, although it was never to become the quarter occupied specifically by administrative agencies of the state nor a European or foreign enclave. In fact, the northern residential zone predominantly remained the affluent quarter, the site of diplomatic winter residences. Examination of the 1892 map, in conjunction with the registrations of 1900 to 1902-3, shows that in the new quarters, of initially modern aspect, there were created sub-quarters of traditional structure, most of them centred around the palaces of princes and of dignitaries. At the end of the reign of Nāṣir al-Dīn Shāh, these new quarters were still property mostly held by the descendants of Mustawfī al-Mamālik and of Mīrzā 'Īsā, thus illustrating the traditional social inequalities which were intensified with the growth of financial speculation (Gurney, 70-1; for the register of Akhḍar 'Alī Shāh, begun in 1317/1900 and concluded in 1320/1902-3, see Ettehadih [1983], 200; and comparative table with preceding registers, 204 ff.; *Āmār*, 353-651).

In spite of governmental and private initiatives, modernisation remained limited. Always problematical, the supply of water was still operated by means of *kanāts* and water drawn from the Karādj river, transported by a promenade-canal to the north of the city (from the 1840s onward). Public facilities appeared gradually: horse-tramways and street-lighting, with oil or gas (1880); carriages for hire (1891); steam railway, Tihṛān to Shāh 'Abd al-'Azīm (1888-93); electrification, in the palace (1887) then in the city (1908; eight years after Mashhad!). The creation of a modern police-force (1879) was followed by the promulgation of the first rules regulating urban policy and utilisation of public highways (1896). The first motor cars appeared ca. 1900 (initially in the service of the Shāh). Lorry

transport, organised by the Russians, began to reach Tihṛān in 1910. It was also after the tumult of the Constitutional Revolution (1905-6) that, to alleviate the congestion of Tihṛān, regulations were enacted for the operation of carriages. With the intensification of carriage and then of motorised traffic, during and after the First World War, other measures were taken (see Moghtader, 48; Floor, 176 ff.). Public lighting remained poor, on account of deficiencies in the gas-works installed in 1880. In spite of the introduction of electricity (1908), until 1926 lighting was predominantly supplied by oil-lamps rather than by electric bulbs (Floor, 193). The chief of the new police force (1879), the Austrian "Count Monteforte", established an office for the control of prices and a section entrusted with maintenance of the highways and the removal of horse-dung. However, the condition of the streets remained deplorable; strewn with excrement and generally unpaved, they were muddy in winter and dusty in summer. Funds allocated to paving, raised by a tax on vehicles, effected little improvement. But despite their limited effects, the initiatives taken under the Kādījār government in respect of urbanisation, traffic management and public hygiene, laid the foundations of an urban infrastructure worthy of a modern city (Floor, 194 ff.).

Although its appearance had changed little under the successors of Nāṣir al-Dīn Shāh, it seems that Tihṛān experienced a relatively slow growth in population until the time of the Pahlawīs. But the figures are unreliable, particularly on account of seasonal migrations, fluctuating numbers of immigrants, temporary residents, etc. According to testimonies and the interpretation of reports, estimates vary. From the first "census" ('Abd al-Ghaffār, 1868), a population of 155,736 inhabitants has been estimated (Moghtader, 46, quoting N. Pakdaman [1974]). 'Abd al-Ghaffār's estimate (in 1890-2) of 250,000 inhabitants, half of them living *extra muros*, is exaggerated (Moghtader, 48). A recent study has supplied more reliable numbers: 106,482 in 1883; 160,000 in 1891; 210,000 in 1922; and 310,000 in 1932. An increasing proportion of the population lived outside the walls or outside the administrative district of Tihṛān. The figure of one-and-a-half million was not exceeded until 1956 (H. Zandjani, *Téhéran et sa population: deux siècles d'histoire*, in *Téhéran, capitale bicentenaire*, 251-66, 251-2).

(ii) Built-up space and monuments

Compared with that of prestigious former capitals of the Persian world, the architectural appearance of Tihṛān remains rather disappointing. On account of their lack of interest, through negligence or arbitrary decision, few ancient constructions have survived, as is shown by the chronology of architectural projects sketched below.

Although benefiting by the destruction of Rayy by the Mongols (1220), the decline of Warāmīn and the attention of certain potentates, this large agricultural village, "garden of troglodytes", only became an important town under the last Ilkhānids in the 8th/14th century. According to Clavijo, ambassador to the court of Tīmūr, in 1404, the "city" (*ciudad*) possessed one residential palace. There were also at least two other palaces and some mausolea (Adle, 23 ff.; localisation of the residential palace in the Tīmūrid park, 31). The mausolea were situated within or on the periphery of the Tīmūrid town: Buḡa-yi Sayyid Ismā'īl, Imāmzāda Yaḥyā, Imāmzāda Zayd and Imāmzāda Sayyid Naṣr al-Dīn (Adle, 32-3, with localisation and current state of the monuments). Under the Ṣafawids, in 1554, Ṭahmāsp I was responsible for the construction of

a Bāzār (partially covered) and a perimeter wall furnished with four gates and 114 towers (see above); frequently repaired, this wall survived until its demolition in 1868. Despite his contempt for Tīhrān, Shāh 'Abbās I had a Čahar Bāgh (garden-promenade) laid out, and constructed a palace-citadel (Arg). Shāh Sulaymān was responsible for the building of a *diwān-khāna* where Shāh Sulṭān Ḥusayn received the Ottoman ambassador Dürrī Efendi in 1722 (Dhukā, 2-3; Karīmān, 120 ff.).

Despite these architectural projects, the proportion of open space broadly exceeded that of the buildings. In the 17th century, Tīhrān retained its appearance of an "inhabited garden" (Adle, 35). The bone of contention between various potentates, the town and its inhabitants suffered during the Afghan interlude (1722-9), and also during the reigns of Nādir Shāh (1736-47) and of his successors, with the rivalry between the Kādjar tribal chieftains and Karīm Khān Zand (see above). The latter took the city from Muḥammad Ḥasan Khān Kādjar in 1759 and intended to make it his capital. In 1772 he had the walls restored and built structures (*haram*, *khilwat-khāna*, *diwān-khāna*) in the Safawid Arg (Karīmān, 181 ff.). It was probably he who first provided the Arg with a rampart and a ditch, apparently non-existent in the Safawid period. He entrusted this work to Ustād Ghulām Riḍā-yi Tabrizī. Unable to maintain his position in the north, he established his capital at Shīrāz in 1176/1762-3 (Dhukā, 4 ff., 17).

Āghā Muḥammad Khān was well acquainted with Tīhrān where, as a very young man, he had been sent, as a prisoner, to Karīm Khān (see above). Since his return to the north and his long struggle for power, he had organised the construction of palace-gardens at Māzandarān, at Astarābād (1791) and at Sārī, with a reception-hall opening on a *tālār* (monumental porch) with columns in the style of the Safawid palaces. When making Tīhrān his capital (1200/1786) he laid the foundations of the monumental complex of the imperial palace of the Arg, the Kākhi Gulistān of Fath 'Alī Shāh and his successors. He enlarged the Zand palace (Dīwān-i Dār al-Imāra), incorporating into it elements from the palace of the Wakīl (Karīm Khān), brought back from Shīrāz, and had the Arg surrounded by a ditch. To the north-east of Tīhrān, beyond Damāvand, he had a garden-pavilion constructed (Dhukā, 45 ff., 111 ff.; Karīmān, 187 ff.; Scarce [1983], 333-4). But the true founders of the metropolis of Tīhrān were Fath 'Alī Shāh and his great-grandson Nāsir al-Dīn Shāh, their way of life and manner of government being reflected in the style of their capital. Unlike his uncle Āghā Muḥammad, a traditional tribal khān, Fath 'Alī Shāh had a taste for luxury and ostentatious ceremonial and he maintained an extensive *haram*. To satisfy his peripatetic predilections, appropriate to the way of life and political interests of his tribal family, in relation to Tīhrān and its environs, he constructed and maintained extramural palatial gardens close to the northern fringes of the town (Nigāristān, 1810; Lālarzar) or further afield (Sulaymāniyya, at Karādj, and in particular Kaṣr-i Kādjar in the Shāmīrānāt, 1807, which survived until the 1950s). Through piety or the need for prestige, he also endowed Tīhrān with its first public buildings: the Masjid-i Shāh, built according to the principles of traditional Persian architecture, near the northern entrance of the Bāzār, between 1808 and 1813; North Gate of the Bāzār on the Sabza Maydān adjacent to the Maydān-i Shāh; and Shāh 'Abd al-'Azīm Gate, the southern entrance to the city. Also owed to him

are other more modest religious edifices: Masjid Sayyid 'Azīz Allāh (1824); Madrasa-yi Khān-i Marwī (1830); see Moghtader, 41-2, Scarce [1992], 75 ff. As for the citadel of the Arg, it seems that, from 1806 onwards, Fath 'Alī Shāh had set about transforming or renovating, with additions, the constructions of Karīm Khān and Āghā Muḥammad Khān. These changes were modified in their turn by Nāsir al-Dīn Shāh in the course of the modernisations commenced in 1867. Among these architectural projects, which borrowed especially from the *tālārs* with columns of Isfahān, notable are: the monumental gate called Darb-i Sa'adat, also known as 'Alī Kāpū or 'Imārat-i Sardar, which opened on the garden of the throne room, Aywān-i Takht-i marmar, a monumental *tālār* sheltering an impressive marble throne, also called Takht-i Sulaymāniyya or Dīwān-khāna, serving as a reception room, much influenced by the architecture of Shīrāz under Karīm Khān; the 'Imārat-i Bādgīr (palace with wind tower). Some of these constructions, as well as the Khilwat-i Karīm Khānī, were progressively incorporated into the palatial complex of the Kākhi Gulistān, the biggest monumental structure of the Arg; the stages of the latter's construction remain uncertain. The Gulistān served as an administrative and residential centre, in winter, for Fath 'Alī Shāh, his extensive family and his allies (Dhukā, 47 ff.; Scarce [1983], 335 ff.; Karīmān, 201 ff.; Scarce [1991], 910 ff.; eadem [1992], 78 ff.).

Under Muḥammad Shāh (1834-48), with the *extra muros* development, the vizier Ḥādjdjī Mīrzā Ākāsi had residences and gardens built in the north (Muḥammadiyya, 'Abbāsābād). He had a 42 km-long canal dug to convey to Tīhrān some of the waters of the Karādj river. In the Arg, he built an arsenal and a *takya*, near the Russian legation, for commemorations of Muḥarram and staging of *ta'ziyas* [q.v.]. Religious buildings were also built in Tīhrān: Masjid Ḥādjdjī Riḍā 'Alī, Imāmzāda Ismā'il in the *bāzār* (Karīmān, 212; Moghtader, 42; Calmard [1974], 100 ff.). Muḥammad Shāh and Ḥādjdjī Mīrzā also founded the quarters of the New Gate (Maḥalla-yi Darvāza-yi naw/ Darvāza Muḥammadiyya) and 'Abbāsābād, which would be populated by immigrants from Ādharbaydjan and from khānates which had fallen into Russian hands (Karīmān, 210-11).

Like Fath 'Alī Shāh, Nāsir al-Dīn Shāh was an energetic builder. He maintained the Kādjar custom of abandoning or adapting the constructions of his predecessors. His migrations to summer residences were less wide-ranging, being concentrated essentially in the Shāmīrānāt. The development of contacts with Europe and the travels of the Shāh, from 1873 onwards, led to innovations in the architectural projects undertaken, with the renovation of Tīhrān since 1867 (see above). The three-phase renovation was applied first of all to the constructions of the Arg and the Gulistān palace, which was redesigned between 1867 and 1892, according to a plan maintaining segregation between public and private zones. In the first phase (1867-73), he was responsible for the erection of the Shams al-'Imāra, the first five-storey building seen in Persia. Commissioned at the same time, the Takya Dawlat, a large circular edifice covered with a *velum* during religious or civil ceremonies, was built later (completed in 1873?). An *andarīn* was built behind the Takht-i Marmar. In the second phase (1873-82), he obliterated the constructions undertaken by Fath 'Alī Shāh to the north of the palace, with the exception of the Takht-i Marmar. In their stead, he had built the imposing two-storey façade of the Gulistān palace, the

entrance hall of which, decorated with multiple mirrors, led to a large staircase of two flights, giving access to a massive rectangular chamber with alcoves. This Tālār-i Salām or Uṭāq-i Mūza (Museum) accommodated the Shāh's collections of heterogeneous objects. An orangery (Nārandjīstān) was built and the walls of the palace decorated with ceramic tiles. In the third phase (1888-92), he ordered the construction of a new *andarūn*, the rooms of which opened on a courtyard, a private building in European style (K̄h^āābgāh) and a small palace, Kāk̄h-i Abyād. In the Shamirānāt, above and below the Kaṣr-i Kād̄jār, he had built, in 1888, the palaces of 'Ishratābād (K̄h^āābgāh) and Saltanātābād, its architectural style resembling that of the Gulīstān palace. Other summer palaces were built, the northernmost being the Šāhīkīrāniyya at Niyāwarān, after the obliteration of the palace constructed by Fath 'Alī Shāh and adapted by Muḥammad Shāh (Scarce [1991], 921 ff.; eadem [1992], 88 ff.).

Despite the sometimes ostentatious piety of Nāšir al-Dīn Shāh (cf. his pilgrimages to Shāh 'Abd al-'Azīm where he was assassinated), his reign marks an overall decline in religious constructions. He seems to have confined himself to restoring or embellishing the constructions of Fath 'Alī Shāh (Masjdīd-i Shāh, Shāh 'Abd al-'Azīm). He had two small *madrasas* built: Shaykh 'Abd al-Husayn (1862); the old *Madrasa-yi Sipahsālār* in the Bāzār-i Marwī (1866). But the most prestigious monument, the Masjdīd-Madrasa-yi Sipahsālār, was financed and constructed by two of his viziers, Mīrzā Husayn K̄hān and his brother Mīrzā Yahyā K̄hān, between 1879 and 1890. Erected to the north-east of the new town, it constitutes one of the most successful examples of the Persian architecture of the 19th century. Although it is of classical square design, with four *aywāns*, in a break with tradition its recessed main entrance, flanked by two minarets, opens on a vestibule giving access to a huge courtyard surrounded by arcaded loggias. The façade of the southern *aywān* is dominated by four imposing minarets. Although of classical crafting, the decoration with ceramic tiles shows European influences. Numerous secular buildings were also constructed in Tihṙān under Nāšir al-Dīn Shāh by princes or members of the nobility. In 1878, his eldest son Mas'ūd Mīrzā Zill al-Sulṭān had a palace constructed close to the site of the Masjdīd-i Sipahsālār. Although this building has been converted to become the Ministry of Education, its entrance façade remains a fine example of Kād̄jār style (Dhukā, 122 ff. and index; Karīmān, 212 ff.; Scarce [1983], 338 ff., eadem [1991], 921 ff.; eadem [1992], 82 ff.).

The summer palace of Nāšir al-Dīn Shāh constitutes the apogée of civilian architecture under the Kād̄jārs. Among his successors, only Muẓaffar al-Dīn Shāh (1896-1907 [q.v.]) also undertook architectural projects, and this to a very limited extent. Decorations with ceramic tiles representing Persian motifs in a Euro-Persian style were effected in the Gulīstān palace (1899). A lover of Persian gardens, he had a garden-palace constructed to the east of Tihṙān, at Duṣhān Tepe, a country retreat especially favoured by Nāšir al-Dīn Shāh (Scarce [1983], 341). The Kād̄jār style, influenced to an increasing extent by Europe, recurs in numerous private or public buildings (*takhas*, in particular) erected at the expense of princes, dignitaries, merchants or other individuals or groups. Revived in public or private construction projects, these architectural vestiges have gradually disappeared, especially since the 1960s, the destruction of Kād̄jār urbanism ultimately rendering the 19th-century city unrecognisable.

(iii) *Cultural and socio-economic life*

Like the city of Rayy on which it was dependent, Tihṙān must have accommodated, at a very early stage, a Shī'ī community. Its inhabitants were also renowned for their belligerent, quarrelsome and rapacious nature; rebellious towards political authority, they were particularly reluctant to pay taxes (Adle, 27 ff., criticising Karīmān, 100 ff.).

The earliest known inhabitant of Tihṙān is apparently, in the 3rd/9th century, the *muhaddīth* Muḥammad b. Hammād Abū 'Abd Allāh al-Tihṙānī al-Rāzī, ancestor of al-Sam'ānī (Adle, 21, and above). Other '*ulamā'*', as well as numerous scholars, poets, politicians, etc., have been natives of Tihṙān, especially since the Šafawid period and under the Kād̄jārs. Besides the *nīsha* Tihṙānī or Tihṙānī Rāzī, they are often known by the names of the villages or quarters which ultimately constituted the extended area of Tihṙān: Djaybāynī, Dulābī, Duruṣhūtī/Turuṣhūtī, Kanī, Kaṣrānī, Nārmakī, etc. (see Karīmān, 455 ff.). Since the Kād̄jār period, increasing numbers of immigrants, especially from the Caspian provinces, have become Tihṙānīs, but use of the *nīsha*, including that of adoption, has generally disappeared.

Cultural life developed with the establishment of the political power and the court of Fath 'Alī Shāh in Tihṙān, at least during the winter period. Influenced by Europe since the mid-17th century, painting was in overall decline. But alongside the production of paintings in oil on canvas according to the European technique, a reversion to Šafawid models is observed, especially in the miniature, painting on lacquered papier-mâché or on glass, the art of the book and ceramics. The most attractive Kād̄jār paintings are those effected on lacquered or enamelled objects. In addition to traditional designs featuring flora and fauna, the art of the portrait—of the sovereign and of leading courtiers—occupies a significant position in this pictorial corpus, especially in the decorations of palaces. Interesting productions are supplied by architecture and its related décor, in secular as well as religious buildings, and by the arts of metalwork and of textiles (produced in traditional centres, marketed and used to a certain extent in Tihṙān): see B.W. Robinson, *Persian painting under the Zand and Qajar dynasties*, in *CHI*, vii, 870-89, at 874 ff.; Scarce [1983, 1991, 1992]. But it was in particular the literary revival (*bāz gashṭ-i adabī*), beginning in Iṣfahān and Shīrāz in the 18th century, and the neo-classical poetry of the court which gave the greatest lustre to the Kād̄jār dynasty (see IRĀN. vii. Literature, D). However, the poets of the Kād̄jār period were for the most part residents of towns and provinces where literary production continued to be highly prized, and Tihṙān lagged far behind Kāshān, Shīrāz, Kirmān, Tabrīz, etc. (Ettehadieh [1992], 128, 136). The literary revival coincided with an upsurge in western influence in Persia, new ideas first penetrating the court of the prince 'Abbās Mīrzā in Tabrīz, defeated militarily by the Russians (1813, 1828). After the premature death of this reforming prince (1833), cultural life was concentrated rather in Tihṙān, which assumed a pre-dominant role largely through the development of techniques of printing (typography, more aesthetic lithography, then return to typography [see MATBA'Ā. 3.]) and modern methods of education, particularly following the creation in Tihṙān of the Dār al-Funūn, on the initiative of the vizier Mīrzā Taḳī K̄hān "Amīr Kabīr" in 1268/1851 (see J. Gurney and N. Nabavi, *Elr*, art. *Dār al-funūn*).

These modern methods were to facilitate access to

numerous ancient and contemporary texts, including travel literature, memoirs, history, etc. which were at that time widely distributed. Also assisted by this development was to be the publication of translations of works into European languages which, undertaken under 'Abbās Mīrẓā in Tabrīz, would be continued in Tīhrān on the initiative of the vizier Hādjī Mīrẓā Ākāsi. Under Nāṣir al-Dīn Shāh, Muhammad Hasan Khān Thānī al-Dawla (later known as I'timād al-Saltāna), trained at the Dar al-Funūn and then in France, was to be responsible for a department of translations. It was also in Tīhrān in 1253/1837 that the first Persian newspaper appeared, the *Kāghaz-i akhbār*, published by Mīrẓā Šālīh. It lasted no more than a year or two. In 1851, Amīr Kabīr was responsible for the appearance of a kind of official periodical, published weekly, the *Wākayī-i ittifaqīyya* which became, in 1860-1, the *Rūznāma-yi dawlat-i 'āliyya-yi Irān*, then the *Rūznāma-yi Irān* published by I'timād al-Saltāna [see DĪARĪDA. ii].

Other titles followed and publishing houses proliferated in Tīhrān, as well as intellectual and educational activities, particularly for the benefit of women and especially in the wake of the Constitutional Revolution of 1905-6. Under the Kādjārs, it was in Tīhrān that the greatest number of books and journals was published, Tabrīz coming in second place (Ettehadieh [1992], 129 ff.). On literature and the press under the Kādjārs, see in particular B. Fragner, *Persische Memoiren-literatur als Quelle zur neueren Geschichte Irans*, Wiesbaden 1979; Y. Aryanpur, *Az Šabā tā Nīmā*, 2 vols., Tīhrān 1354/1974-5; P. Avery, *Printing, the press and literature in modern Iran*, in *CHIr*, vii, 815-69; M. Edjehadi, *Zerfall der Staatsmacht Persiens unter Nāṣir al-Dīn Shah Qāğār (1848-1696)*, Berlin 1992; articles on Persian journals feature alphabetically, under their titles, in *ELr*.

Even before the appearance of the Persian opposition press (published abroad) criticising the autocratic power of the Kādjārs, poets and other scholars had used their writings for the cautious expression of discontent and of demand for reforms. Criticisms of the court of Nāṣir al-Dīn Shāh were formulated by a noted courtier, I'timād al-Saltāna, in his memoirs (*Rūznāma-yi khātirāt*, ed. I. Afshār, Tīhrān 1345-50/1966-71, and in a more virulent form in his polemical work entitled *Khālsā* or *Kh'āb-nāma* (ed. Tīhrān 1348/1969; see Calmard [1976-77 B], 172 ff.; Edjehadi, *op. cit.* above; B. Alavi, *Critical writing on the renewal of Iran*, in *Qajar Iran*, 243-54, at 249-50). Originating from all quarters, criticism intensified with the constitutional movement (see below).

In an effort aimed at the centralisation of secular and religious powers, Fath 'Alī Shāh attempted to attract certain important Imāmī *muḍtāhid*s to Tīhrān. But it was Iṣfahān which remained a kind of religious capital until the beginning of the reign of Nāṣir al-Dīn Shāh, numerous Imāmī 'ulamā' also residing in other religious centres in Persia and especially in the 'atabāt [q.v. in Suppl.]; see Algar, 51 ff. When Sayyid Ḥasan Wā'iz Shīrāzī established himself in Tīhrān, with the approval of Fath 'Alī Shāh, he had *takyas* converted into *madrasas* (*ibid.*, 51). However, it was with the development of popular religion, especially of Shī'ī rituals, and the spread of *takyas* designed for performances of *ta'ziya-kh'ānī* or *shābīh-kh'ānī* that the Tīhrānīs, of diverse origins regained their social cohesion (Calmard [1976-7 B], 189). With the taste for ceremonial and diverse spectacles (popular story-tellers, clowns, puppets, theatre of traditional comic improvisation, or that inspired by or based on European

models, etc.), places of such entertainment increased in Tīhrān. But the Takya Dawlat, which enjoyed great success from the 1870s onward, rapidly became a symbol of the ostentatious bad taste of the Kādjārs. Abandoned after the Constitutional Revolution, this site of religious and secular ceremonies was destroyed in 1325/1946-7 (see Calmard, *Méénat*, ii, 141 ff.; F. Gaffary, *Les lieux de spectacle à Téhéran*, in *Téhéran, capitale bicentenaire*, 141-52; P. Chelkowski, *Popular entertainment, media and social change in twentieth-century Iran*, in *CHIr*, vii, 765-814). With its composite character, the population of Tīhrān was the reflection of a Persian society that had been in crisis since the end of the Šafawid period. Although the introduction of new ideas and competition for political or religious power often took place elsewhere, it was in Tīhrān that conflicts were resolved, and it was there that the often confused aspirations for change gained solid expression. Messianic themes, variously articulated among *uṣūlī* and *akhbārī* Imāmīs, among Shaykhīs and Šūfīs, and in popular religion, found their full expression in the Bābism which was firmly repressed under the government of Amīr Kabīr (1848-51) and especially in Tīhrān, after the failed Bābī insurrection against Nāṣir al-Dīn (15 August 1852), followed by the schism between disciples of Šubh-i Azal [q.v.], designated successor of the Bāb (the Bābī Azalī movement), and supporters of Bahā' Allāh [q.v.] (the Bahā'ī movement, with modernist and universalist themes): see D. MacEoin, *ELr*, arts. *Babism and Bahai faith* or *Bahaism*.

Despite the mistrustful attitude of Imāmism towards temporal power and reforms, certain Imāmī 'ulamā' collaborated with the Kādjār administration. This was especially evident in regard to the attribution of the post of *Imām ḡum'a* of Tīhrān to a trusted ally of the monarchy (Algar, 161-2). But in general, the Imāmī 'ulamā', who were then consolidating and politicising their leadership, were opposed to the politics of modernisation and objected in particular to the granting of concessions in the Persian economy to foreign firms, initially British ones, and then Russian or European ones after 1872. This struggle against foreign influence took concrete shape in the revolt against the granting of the monopoly on Persian tobacco to a British concessionaire after the Shāh's third visit to Europe (1889). Agitation began after the ruthless eviction of the reformist Asadābādī, known as al-Afghānī, from the sanctuary of Shāh 'Abd al-'Azīm in January 1891. Promoted by discontented merchants and certain 'ulamā' at the 'atabāt, the general boycott of the consumption of tobacco, effective throughout Persia, including in the Shāh's *andarūn*, led to the cancellation of the concession in early 1892. Agitation was maintained in Tīhrān by the most respected chief of the 'ulamā', Hādjī Mīrẓā Ḥasan Āshūyānī, acting on behalf of the *marḡā-i taklīd* [q.v.] Mīrẓā Ḥasan Shīrāzī, in his letter denouncing the monopoly (N.R. Keddie, *Religion and rebellion in Iran. The Iranian tobacco protest of 1881-1892*, London 1966, index, under "Tehran"; Algar, 211 ff.).

Maintained in Tīhrān by certain 'ulamā' and reformist or radical elements grouped into various associations (see M. Bayat, *ELr*, art. *Anjoman. i. Political*), agitation culminated under Muẓaffar al-Dīn Shāh [q.v.] in the so-called Constitutional Revolution of 1905-6. In this huge socio-religious movement there were found in Tīhrān all the elements of the struggle against Kādjār autocracy: conflicting attitudes of the pro- and anti-constitutionalist 'ulamā'; activism blended with conservatism on the part of the merchants and the "petite bourgeoisie"; ambiguity of demands, rang-

ing from an 'adālat-khāna ("house of justice") to a constitution (*mashrūṭiyat*) and the establishment of an elected assembly, *maǧlis*; expanded role of the press, of tracts (*shāb-nāmas*); increasing presence of crowds; protests undertaken in the religious or diplomatic sanctuaries (*bast* [q.v.] and see also Calmard, *Elr*, art. *Bast*); etc. After the granting of a constitution and of a *maǧlis*, the efforts of the constitutionalists were countered by a reaction, as much royalist as religious, under Muḥammad 'Alī Shāh (1907-9 [q.v.]). Two religious leaders, bearing the honorific title of Āyat Allāh [q.v. in Suppl.] supported the constitution: Sayyid Muḥammad Tabātabā'i, in favour of the reforms, and Sayyid 'Abd Allāh Bihbahānī, allied to the leading merchants, opposed to customs and fiscal reform. Shāykh Faḍl Allāh Nūrī [q.v.] opposed the constitution. The stances adopted by political and religious leaders led to a virtual civil war between pro- and anti-constitutionalists (June 1908-July 1909, entry into Tihirān of northern revolutionaries commanded by the *Sipahdār-i a'zam* and of Bakhtiyārīs from Isfahān; and execution of Shāykh Faḍl Allāh). Muḥammad 'Alī Shāh had organised the suppression of the insurrection in Tihirān by the Cossack Brigade and ordered the closure of the *Maǧlis*; this was re-opened by his successor Aḥmad Shāh (1909-25 [q.v.]) in November 1909. This second legislature was marked by disagreements within the assembly, the continuation of the civil war, principally in the north but extending as far as Tihirān, and attempts at reform (by American financial experts led by Morgan Shushter). The Russian military threat caused the departure of Shushter and the fall of the Second *Maǧlis* (December 1911) and of the revolutionary movement, parliamentary functions passing henceforward into the hands of the bureaucracy and of landowners (see Vanessa Martin, *Islam and modernism. The Iranian Revolution of 1906*, London 1989; E. Abrahamian, *Iran between two revolutions*, Princeton 1982, 69 ff.).

The weakness of Persia was clearly evident during the First World War. Occupied by Russian and Turkish troops, the land was the object of rivalry between the major powers (Russia, Turkey, Germany and Great Britain) which fomented local seditions. The sovereignty of Tihirān was much reduced. Russian revolutionary movements had more effect on Ādharbāyḍjān (Tabrīz) or Gilān (the *Djanganī* movement [q.v.]) than on Tihirān, where foreign domination, especially Russian and later British (Anglo-Persian Accord of 1919, never implemented) was strongly resented. The *coup d'état* of the Cossack colonel Riḍā Khān in Tihirān (February 1921) was presented by the latter as intended to save the monarchy from revolution (Abrahamian, *ibid.*, 102 ff.). The too often fickle or opportunistic character of the Tihirānī population, as revealed at the time of the dramatic events of the Constitutional Revolution and its aftermath, have sometimes been severely criticised by intellectuals. This was notably the case of the eminent poet, writer, journalist and professor Muḥammad Taqī Bahār (1886-1951). Scion of a family of wealthy merchants from Kashān, established in Khurāsān, he set out at a very early age for Tihirān where he became both an activist and a critical observer of events. A fervent patriot, in numerous poems he expresses his hatred of Tihirān (often called Rayy in poetry), the urban milieu and the Tihirānī population, whom he accuses of weakness, immorality, inconsistency, perversity, lack of patriotism, etc. (see H. Saraj, *La notion de patrie "Vaṭan" a travers la poésie de Mohammad Taqi Saburi dit Bahār Malek al-Sofarā (1886-1951)*, diss. University of Paris III, June 1997, 181 ff., 419 ff.).

Although promoted to the status of capital, in the 1840s Tihirān occupied only the second or the third place in commercial activity, after Tabrīz (report of the British consul Abbott, in Ch. Issawi, *The economic history of Iran, 1800-1914*, Chicago 1971, 118). However, although the city was then above all a distributive centre for merchandise, diverse factors were to facilitate the development of its economy. As had been the case with Isfahān or Shīrāz, Tihirān benefited by the centralisation common to the great Persian capitals: concentration of governmental revenues ("despotic capitalism"); population movements (rural exodus); the attraction of élites, of landowners and of tribal chiefs. These factors were to enable it to emerge in the 20th century as a place of economic importance in world commerce (see E. Ehlers, *Capitals and spatial organization in Iran: Esfahan, Shiraz, Tehran*, in *Téhéran, capitale bicentenaire*, 155-72).

Bibliography (and abbreviations): On the numerous primary and secondary sources in Persian and in European languages, see the *Bibls.* of the works listed below:

C. Adle, *Le jardin habité ou Téhéran de jadis des origines aux Safavides*, in *Téhéran, capitale bicentenaire*, 15-37; *Āmār* = S. Sa'dwandiyan and M. Itūhādiyya (Ettehadieh), *Āmār-i dār al-khilāfa-yi Tihirān*, Tihirān 1368; Calmard [1972] = J. Calmard, *Les étendards funéraires shiites et leurs désignations turco-mongoles*, in *Traditions religieuses et para-religieuses des peuples altaïques*, Paris 1972, 27-40; Calmard [1974] = idem, *Le mécénat des représentations de ta'ziyē. I. Les précurseurs de Nāseroddin Chāh*, in *Le monde iranien et l'islam*, ii (1974), 73-126; Calmard [1976-77 A] = idem, *Le mécénat des représentations de ta'ziyē. II. Les débuts du règne de Nāseroddin Chāh*, in *ibid.*, iv (1976-7), 133-62; Calmard [1976-77 B] = idem, *L'Iran sous Nāseroddin Chāh et les derniers Qājārs*, in *ibid.*, iv (1976-7), 169-94; *CHI* = *Cambridge history of Iran*; Dhukā = Y. Dhukā, *Tārikhā-yi sākhūmānāhī-yi Arg-i salṭanatī-yi Tihirān...*, Tihirān 1349/1970; Ettehadieh [1983] = M. Ettehadieh, *Patterns in urban development: the growth of Tehran (1852-1903)*, in *Qajar Iran*, 199-212; Ettehadieh [1992] = M. Ettehadieh Nezam-Mafi, *The emergence of Tehran as the cultural center of Iran*, in *Téhéran, capitale bicentenaire*, 127-39; Floor = W. Floor, *Les premières règles de police urbaine à Téhéran*, in *ibid.*, 173-98; Gurney = J.D. Gurney, *The transformation of Tehran in the later nineteenth century*, in *ibid.*, 51-71; Karīmān = H. Karīmān, *Tihirān dar guḍhashā wa hāl*, Tihirān 2535 *shāhānshāhī*/1976; *Qajar Iran* = E. Bosworth and C. Hillenbrand (eds.), *Qajar Iran. Political, social and cultural change 1800-1925*, Edinburgh 1983; Moghtader = M.-R. Moghtader, *Téhéran dans ses murailles (1553-1930)*, in *Téhéran, capitale bicentenaire*, 39-49; N. Nadjmi, *Dār al-khilāfa-yi Tihirān*, 2nd ed. Tihirān 1362/1983; idem, *Tihirān-i 'ahd-i Nāsirī*, Tihirān 1364/1985; Scarce [1983] = J.M. Scarce, *The royal palaces of the Qajar dynasty: a survey*, in *Qajar Iran*, 329-44 (15 extra-textual plates); Scarce [1991] = eadem, *The role of architecture in the creation of Tehran*, in *Téhéran, capitale bicentenaire*, 73-94; Dj. Shahrī, *Tārikh-i idjūmā'i-yi Tihirān dar kam-i sizdahum*, 6 vols. Tihirān 1367-8/1988-9; *Téhéran, capitale bicentenaire* = C. Adle and B. Hourcade (eds.), *Téhéran, capitale bicentenaire*, Paris-Tehran 1992.

(J. CALMARD)

(c) Since the advent of the Pahlavīs.

On the accession of Riḍā Shāh, in 1925, the structure of Tihirān had not changed since the construction of new defensive walls during the reign of Nāsir al-Dīn Shāh. The development of the city proceeded to the detriment of gardens and the region outside

the walls, particularly to the south of Darwāza Kār where an impoverished population lived in close proximity to the municipal brickworks. Despite the enlargement of certain streets, there were no modern buildings or avenues appropriate to the status of a capital city.

With the reign of Riḍā Shāh Pahlavī, the structures of the city were radically transformed and Tihṙān became in truth the capital of the country. In 1930, the Law of the Municipality (*kānūn-i baladiyya*) led to the realisation of the first urbanisation plan with the construction of major avenues (Law of 1312/1933), crossing the ancient urban fabric or the line of the defensive walls (Habibi, 200). Iran was also endowed with a proper government (first national budget in 1933), which entailed the hasty construction of buildings for various ministries (Foreign Affairs, War, Finance and Justice) and public services (post, rail station and archaeological museum constructed by Godard, 1936) on the old parade ground (Maydān-i Mashk) and to the north of the quarter of Sangilādj which was completely demolished to be replaced later, in 1950, by the Park-i Shahr.

The city was henceforward organised on the basis of large rectilinear avenues, oriented north-south or east-west, fringed by trees. This chequer pattern definitively shattered the cultural and social logic of the quarters of the old Islamic town; henceforward, cultural and social differentiation was determined on the basis of sectors bordered by the major avenues, the more affluent living at a higher altitude, towards the north, and the poorer towards the south, at a level where the water of the numerous *qūbs* was polluted. The urban landscape was radically transformed by the creation of a new public space, around numerous squares (*maydān*) and along avenues flanked by services (banks and administrative premises) and shops with display-windows open on the street.

For the first time, Tihṙān was endowed with modern buildings, constructed by foreign professional architects (André Godard, Maxime Siroux and Nicolai Marcoff) and especially by Iranians (Mohsen Foroghi, Vartan Avassessian, Gabriel Guevrekian, Ali Sadegh and Iraj Moshiri) (Marefat, 104-22). The new dominant architecture broke with tradition. It was characterised by a monumental European style, especially German (the station) combined with a "national style" of neo-Achaemenid inspiration (Ministry of Justice) and Kādjār elements which remained dominant in individual houses. These urbanisation projects entailed the destruction of a vast quantity of ancient monuments, in particular most of the ancient royal palaces of the Arg (with the exception of that of Gulistān and of Shams al-Imāra), of the famous Dawlat *takiyya* and of the twelve monumental gates (photographs in Bahram-beygui, 25-7).

The city was then bordered to the south by the Shūsh avenue, the railway and the station (constructed in 1938), to the east by the Shāhbāz avenues (17 Shahrivār), to the west the Simeṙi avenue and to the north by the major Shāh Riḍā avenue (now called Khiyābān-i 17 Shahrivār, formerly Kh-i Inḱilāb) which today cuts the city in two and then marked the start of the modern quarters, notably including the University of Tihṙān, of which the foundation-stone was laid in 1935. Tihṙān was split into two parts, with a traditional centre around the bazaar, and a modern centre between Tūp Khāna square (Sipāh), Lālar avenue and the new sector of embassies and banks to the north of Embassy avenue (Firdawsi).

Riḍā Shāh abandoned the Gulistān palace for the Marble Palace, construction of which began in 1935.

In summer he resided in the palaces of Sa'dābād at Tādjriṙish, thus contributing to the accelerated development of these aestival quarters (*yaylāk*) of Shāmirān in the foothills of the Elburz mountains, where wealthy citizens of Tihṙān had long been accustomed to seeking refuge from the heat of summer. To the east of the old Shāmirān road, the avenues of Kākḥ and Pahlavī (Fīlasṙīn and Walī 'Aṣr) were constructed, fringed by plane-trees, to link these two palaces and the two parts of the city, some 10 km/6 miles apart. Towards the south, the sanctuary of Shāh 'Abd al-'Azīm [g.v.] and the lower-class town of Rayy remained separated from Tihṙān by ancient clay quarries and brickworks which had been relocated towards Warāmin, at Karčak and Ḳatumābād.

Despite the opening of an international airline by the German company Junkers between 1927 and 1932, then by Lufthansa from 1938 onward (Fleury, 214, 250), Tihṙān remained in 1941 an incomplete and still quite mediocre capital, poorly connected with the rest of the world. Despite the excavation in 1930 of a new canal 52 km/32 miles in length, diverting water from the Karādj river towards what is now the site of the Kishāvarz boulevard (its predecessor was constructed in 1845), the traditional areas of the town were still supplied with water by *kanāts* and the modern quarters by wells. Running water was not to be installed until after the inauguration of the barrages of Karādj in 1961 and of Latyān (Djādj Rūd) in 1967 (de Planhol, 62). The population of the city nevertheless increased rapidly, from 210,000 in 1922 to 540,000 in 1940, although the area of the city grew only marginally, from 24.7 ha (area enclosed within the defensive walls of Nāṣir al-Dīn Shāh) to 32.2 ha.

Under the reign of Muḥammad Riḍā Pahlavī, the Iranian capital became a major international metropolis, with average annual growth in excess of 6%: 1.5 million inhabitants in 1956, 3 millions in 1966 (including Tādjriṙish and Rayy), 6 in 1986 (Zandjani, 252). In 1996, Greater Tihṙān embraced some 10 million inhabitants including 7.5 for the city itself, henceforward surrounded by a massive suburban area. Since the 1960s, Karādj has developed very rapidly (15,000 inhabitants in 1956, 500,000 in 1991) with the influx of migrants seeking work in the new industrial zone (Bahram-beygui, 158). New towns have appeared like Islāmshahr (350,000 in 1991), Mihrshahr, Radjdjā'shahr and Karčak, while ancient cities such as Warāmin have expanded more slowly (Hourcade [1997], 168). The arrival in Tihṙān, since the Kādjār period, of a substantial population originating from Adhārbāyḍjān has made Tihṙān the biggest Azeri-speaking town of Iran. Since the 1970s, the origin of migrants has been more diverse, with the influx of numerous Kurds, especially in Karādj.

In 1972, Tihṙān covered an area of 210 km², with a continuation of urban space between Tādjriṙish and Rayy, and was marked by a decisive social segregation between the affluent north and the impoverished south (Hourcade [1974], 36-40; Seger [1978] and [1992]. Towards the south, where many migrants congregated, development was blocked by industrial zones and by prohibitions on construction imposed by the urbanisation plan. Development of the city therefore took place towards the north, accelerated by the expansion of a new middle class and the installation of modern heating systems in houses, meaning that the summer quarters to the north of the city could be inhabited throughout the year. This movement engendered substantial property speculation which brought wealth to a new bourgeoisie (Vieille, 1970). The bazaar quarter,

inhabited by the many migrants from the provinces, rapidly became the centre of lower-class Tīhrān; at the same time, what had been the modern centre at the beginning of the century was gradually abandoned by the affluent classes, while retaining its administrative function. To the north of the modern centre of the Nādirī-Istanbul avenues there developed, from 1960 onward, an American-style centre between Takht-i Djamshīd avenue (Tālikānī), site of the headquarters of the Iranian National Oil Company (NIOC) and Elizabeth II boulevard. A new modern centre was subsequently constructed between 'Abbāsābād avenue and Vanak square. By leaving the Marble Palace and transferring to the new palace of Niyavārān in 1962, the royal family reinforced this new social geography of the city which resulted in prodigious daily shifts of population between the residential north and the centre.

The first urbanisation plan, realised in 1969 by the Victor Gruen and Farmānarmāyān partnership, set the limits of the city (*maḥdūda*) for a period of 25 years (Hourcade [1992b], 211). To block the development of the capital towards the south, several urban clusters were envisaged in the direction of Karādj, along the piedmont. On the model of the Pārs quarter of Tīhrān built in 1956 with Pārsi funds from Bombay (de Planhol [1962], 71), or the programme of popular habitation of *Cahār sad dastgāh*, in 1947, numerous developments (*shahrak*) were constructed using public or cooperative funds: large hotels, museums, office buildings or luxury apartments, as well as more modest building projects near to the airport (Ektabān) and at Lavizān. Movement of transport within the city was guaranteed by a network of freeways, modelled on that of Los Angeles.

With the increase in oil prices in 1974, there was a new impetus to the expansion of the capital: a metro scheme was undertaken, and of particular importance was the sovereign's decision to construct the *Shāhīstān-i Pahlavī*, a new administrative, cultural and political district of international status on 554 ha of vacant, formerly military land between 'Abbāsābād and Shāmīrān, according to plans drawn up by the British firm of surveyors Llewellyn Davis International. This very ambitious project threatened the development of other quarters of the city, abrogating the urbanisation plan of 1969 and exacerbating the housing crisis. In the south of the city illegal popular constructions proliferated for the accommodation of the huge numbers of new immigrants.

The Islamic Revolution, which began in provincial cities, reached Tīhrān on 4 September 1978 (the day of the *Id al-fitr*) with the demonstration called by Āyatullāh Tālikānī between the Kaytariyya park to the north of the city and the University of Tīhrān. Over more than three years, public demonstrations assembling on Shāh Riḍā Avenue (renamed Inḳilāb "Revolution") were much larger and more frequent than those which had accompanied the nationalisation of oil and the coup d'état against Muṣaddīk (Mosaddegh) in 1951-3, and contributed significantly to a change in the relationship between the city and its inhabitants. Although the north-south social segregation characterising the capital was not abolished, the population of the south became familiar for the first time with the modern centre and the northern quarters (visits to the residence of Āyatullāh Kḥumaynī at Djamārān) and changed the attitude towards public space which characterised the Islamic city (Hourcade [1980], 34). The relocation of the main political bodies and institutions (Directorate of the Islamic Republic, Presidency, Prime Ministry, Parliament and Justice) in

the same quarter, around the Marble Palace, with Parliament (*Maḥlis-i shūrā-yi islāmī*) in the former Senate and the Prime Minister's office in Pasteur Avenue, also revitalised the urban centre.

The Islamic Republic soon legalised the illegally constructed "revolutionary habitat" (1982), and demolished slums and shanties erected in former quarters (*gawd*) to the south of the city (Hourcade and Khosrokhavar), but major urbanisation projects, including the *Shāhīstān-i Pahlavī* and the metro, were abandoned. The nationalisation of vacant urban land in 1981, then the introduction of a new urbanisation plan in 1992, marked the inception of a new urban policy. The construction of urban motorways was pursued, and a massive programme for the renovation of southern districts of the city was launched, with the construction of cultural centres (Bahman Centre in the former abattoirs) and sport facilities (Amir-Ebrahimi [1998]), the improvement of public services and the opening in 1997 of the monumental Nawāb Avenue, giving access to the motorway leading to Kum and the new international airport. The destruction of old buildings in the ancient centre continues (Anwār), while the creation of numerous parks and public gardens favours the development of new public space. In the north of the city (Ilāhiyya, Niyavārān) the construction of large tower-blocks has revolutionised the urban landscape of quarters, the social composition of which has also changed with the departure of the old imperial bourgeoisie and the arrival of new Islamic cadres. Since 1980, private cars have been banned from the city centre, between the bazaar and 'Abbāsābād. This situation has accelerated the departure of residents and their replacement by offices, businesses, administrative premises and government agencies (*Atlas d'Iran*, 146). This new centre is the hub of the "Greater Tīhrān" as defined by the new urbanisation plan of 1992, which includes the new suburbs and extends over more than 120 km from Abyak to Rudehen, and 30 km from Tādjriṣh to Ribāṭ Karīm; Qazwīn and Kum may now be considered suburbs of the capital (Hourcade [1997]).

With 14% of the total population of the country, Tīhrān is not a city of inordinate size on the national scale, but its economic, administrative and cultural weight is excessive, since the capital accounts for a half of Iran's students, administrators and doctors and three-quarters of all industrial production (Khalīlī-Arākī, 54-6; Hourcade [1998], 20).

Tīhrān remains a capital poor in public monuments. The infrastructure has only been developed since the 1960s and in particular since 1970, with the development of the industrial zone of Karādj, the construction of the first major hotels, modern hospitals, auditoria (Rūdakī Opera [Wahdat]) and public buildings such as the Milli University (*Shāhid Bīhīshī*) to the north of the city. Their architecture, sometimes original (carpet museum by Ḥasan Fāṭhī), rarely benefits from a good environment and despite numerous statues in public squares, decorative monuments are rare. Those representing the Pahlavī sovereigns were demolished in 1979, often being replaced by modern sculptures (Filasṭīn Square) or those representing major historical figures (such as the statue of Rāzī erected on Kārgār Avenue in 1995). The *Shāhyād* Tower, constructed in 1972 near Mihrābād airport to mark the 2,500th anniversary of the foundation of the Persian Empire, has paradoxically become very popular as a symbol of Tīhrān under the name of Azādī ("freedom") Tower.

Bibliography: X. de Planhol, *De la ville islamique*

à la métropole iranienne: quelques aspects du développement contemporain de Téhéran, in *Recherches sur la géographie de l'Iran septentrional*, Paris 1964, 59-76; P.-G. Ahrens, *Die Entwicklung der Stadt Teheran. Eine städtebauliche Untersuchung ihrer zukünftigen Gestaltung*, Opladen 1966; F. Bémont, *Les villes d'Iran*, Paris 1969, 89-145; P. Veille, *Marchée des terrains et société urbaine, recherches sur la ville de Téhéran*, Paris 1970; B. Hourcade, *Téhéran, évolution récente d'une métropole, in Méditerranée*, i (1974), 25-41; A. Fleury, *La pénétration allemande au Moyen-Orient 1919-1939*, Geneva 1977; M. Seger, *Teheran. Eine stadtgeographische Studie*, Wiesbaden 1978; H. Bahrambeygui, *Urban problems of Karag*, in G. Schweizer (ed.), *Interdisziplinäre Iran-Forschung*, Wiesbaden 1979, 157-68; F. Kazemi, *Poverty and revolution in Iran. The migrant poor, urban marginality and politics*, New York 1980; Hourcade, *Géographie de la révolution iranienne*, in *Hérodote*, xviii (1980), 16-45; C. Mechkat, *Téhéran, de la ville islamique à la métropole contemporaine*, in A. Boudhida and M. Chevalier (eds.), *La ville arabe dans l'Islam*, Paris 1982, 475-537; Hourcade and F. Khosrokhavar, *L'habitat révolutionnaire à Téhéran*, in *Hérodote*, xxxi (1983), 62-83; S.M. Khalīlī-Arākī, *Gustarish-i bi-rauyiyi-yi shahr-i Tīhrān*, Tehran 1368/1989; M. Tālikānī, *Maskan*, Tehran 1369/1990; N. Takmīl-Hūmayūn (ed.), *Kūtabshīnāsī-yi Tīhrān*, Tehran 1369/1990; M. Marefat, *The protagonists who shaped Tehran*, in C. Adle and B. Hourcade (eds.), *Téhéran, capitale bicentenaire*, Paris-Tehran 1992, 95-125; M. Habibi, *Reza Chah et le développement de Téhéran (1925-1941)*, in *ibid.*, 199-206; Hourcade, *Urbanisme et crise urbaine sous Mohammad-Reza Pahlavī*, in *ibid.*, 207-22; H. Zandjani, *Téhéran et sa population: deux siècles d'histoire*, in *ibid.*, 251-66; Seger, *Segregation of retail facilities and the bipolar city centre of Tehran*, in *ibid.*, 281-97; A. Anwār, *Karb-i Khīyābān-i Lālazār*, in *Kūtab-i Tīhrān*, iii (1372/1993), 10-53; Hourcade, *L'émergence des banlieues de Téhéran*, in *CEMOTI*, xxiv (1997), 168-81; M. Amir-Ebrahimi, *Le bouleversement culturel du Sud de Téhéran*, in *Les Cahiers de l'Orient*, xlix (1998), 125-8, Hourcade et alii, *Atlas d'Iran*, Paris 1998.

(B. HOURCADE)

II. The former name of a village or small town in the modern province of Iṣfahān, in the *bakhs̄h* of Nadjafābād, lying to the west of that city in lat. 32° 41' N., long. 51° 08' E. in the lower Karwan district.

Al-Sam'ānī, *Ansāb*, ed. Ḥaydarābād, ix, 103-6 (cf. Yākūt, *Buldān*, ed. Beirut, iv, 52), knew of this Tīhrān as "a large village at the gate of Iṣfahān", although he says that it is less known than the Tīhrān of al-Rayy. He nevertheless lists several 'ulamā' from this Tīhrān, the oldest of whom being the traditionist Abū Ṣāliḥ 'Uḳayl b. Yahyā al-Ṭīhrānī, d. 258/872. In more recent times, the name of this place has become Tīrān, cf. Sir A. Houtum Schindler, *Eastern Persian Irāk*, London 1896, 124, 127, 131, who mentions a Tīrān canal which brings water to certain suburbs of Iṣfahān. In ca. 1950 Tīrān had a population of 6,100 (*Farhang-i djuḡhrāfiyā-yi Irān-zamīn*, x, 52).

Bibliography: See also Schwarz, *Iran im Mittelalter*, 659.

(C.E. BOSWORTH)

AL-ṬIHRĀNĪ, ĀGHĀ BUZURG, Twelver Shī'ī scholar and bibliographer (born Tehran 11 Rabī' I 1293/6 April 1876, died Nadjaf 13 Dhū 'l-Hiǧdja 1389/20 February 1970). He stemmed from a merchant family. From 1315/1898 onwards he studied at Nadjaf. After the death in 1329/1911 of his teacher Shaykh Muḥammad Kāzīm Khurāsānī [q.v.], Āghā Buzurg went to Kāzīmān and shortly afterwards to Sāmarrā' in order to study under Muḥammad Takī

al-Shīrāzī [q.v.]. Only in 1354/1936 did he return to Nadjaf, where he remained until his death. Āghā Buzurg's renown as a man of learning is based mainly on the following two reference books:

1. *al-Dhārī'a ilā taṣnīf al-shī'a*, so far the most comprehensive and complete bibliography of works written by Shī'īs. The new edition of Beirut 1983 is in 25 parts, contained in 28 volumes. According to the often transmitted "foundation myth", the composition of the *Dhārī'a* was provoked by the *Ta'riḫ Adāb al-luḡha al-'arabiyya* (4 vols., Cairo 1910-3) by the Lebanese Christian Djirdjī Zaydān [q.v.]. In this work the contribution of the Shī'a to Arabic literature had allegedly not been properly appreciated. Consequently, Sayyid Ḥasan al-Ṣadr (d. 1354/1935), Shaykh Muḥammad al-Husayn Āl Kāshif al-Ghiṭā' (d. 1373/1953-4) and their student Āghā Buzurg agreed to refute Zaydān's statements through appropriate publications about the Shī'a and their culture.

While Kāshif al-Ghiṭā' composed a detailed criticism of Zaydān's work (see the note in *GAL*, S III, 407—*al-Murāǧǧā'at al-rayḥāniyya* and *al-Nukūḍ wa 'l-rudūd*, part ii), and Ḥasan al-Ṣadr occupied himself with the part taken by the Shī'a in the foundation and development of Islamic learning (*Ta'wīs al-shī'a li-'ulūm al-islām*, Kāzimiyya 1951; original title *al-Shī'a wa-junūn al-islām*, Sidon 1912-13), Āghā Buzurg promised to draw up an index of Shī'ī works. For this purpose, he not only used memoirs, biographies, juridical works, library catalogues, handwritten lists of the inventories of private libraries, but also took advantage of his travels and pilgrimages to Persia (four times between 1931 and 1963, especially to Maṣḥhad) and to Mecca in order to visit public and private libraries. On the occasion of his journey to Persia in 1931, his family name *Munzawī* ("the ascetic") was registered for the first time (cf. *al-Dhārī'a*, xv, 128); however, only his sons are known under this name.

The *Dhārī'a* contains ca. 70,000 Persian, Arabic, Turkish and Urdu titles of works composed by Shī'ī authors (according to some critics the assignment of certain works to the Shī'a is not always justified, cf. 'Alī Naḳī Munzawī, 1971, p. *lām*). The works are arranged alphabetically according to their titles; apart from bibliographical indications, each work usually comprises a summary of the contents, information about the author and, in the case of larger thematic units, introductory remarks.

In order to have this work printed, Āghā Buzurg, after returning to Nadjaf, founded the Maṭba'at al-Sa'āda. Because of unfavourable political circumstances, he was, however, forced to sell the printing office. The first three volumes appeared in Nadjaf between 1936 and 1938, while the following ones, with the exception of volumes xiii and xiv which were also published in Nadjaf, were published in Tehran by his two eldest sons 'Alī Naḳī and Aḥmad Munzawī.

2. *Ṭabakāt a'lām al-shī'a*. This work, a by-product of the *Dhārī'a*, contains biographies of Shī'ī scholars, arranged alphabetically according to centuries and names of the authors. During al-Ṭīhrānī's lifetime, there appeared in Nadjaf two volumes on the 13th century A.H., and four volumes on the 14th century A.H. and part of the 5th century A.H. up to Shaykh Tūsī. The volumes on the 4th-10th centuries A.H. were published in Beirut or Tehran by 'Alī Naḳī Munzawī between 1971 and 1984.

In addition to these works in several volumes, numerous other published and un-published writings by Āghā Buzurg have survived, including:

— *Hadīyyat al-rāzī ilā 'l-muǧaddid al-Shīrāzī*, a biog-