

ART. XII.—*On Imperial and other Titles.* By SIR T. E.
COLEBROOKE, Bart., M.P.

THE collection of specimens of imperial titles which will be found in this paper was begun during the recent discussions in Parliament, and with reference to India only. When it was proposed to add to the titles hitherto borne by the Sovereigns of the British Isles another, which was supposed to be more expressive of the relation of the Crown of England to the people and princes of India, it seemed to me important to inquire what were the titles borne by the sovereigns of dynasties in the East whose power could alone compare with our own. Many of the titles of honour, and especially sovereign titles, which have been at different times current in the East, bear a different significance to those in Europe; and to apply to an Eastern dominion titles which had their origin in the public law and policy of the Western world seemed an anachronism, and likely to lead to confusion of language and ideas. Popular language has, indeed, long applied the title of Emperor to the sovereigns of extensive dominions in the East. So far is this carried that it is almost universally used in speaking of all the great monarchies in Asia in modern times, and by grave historians. We read of Emperors of China, of India, of Tartary, and of Constantinople. Thus Gibbon, speaking of Timur, says that the title of Emperor was borne by all his descendants,¹ referring, I suppose, to the rulers at Dehli. He also renders the title *Amir* by Emperor, and the *Amir il Omra* becomes Emperor Imperatorum, though these titles bear only a faint analogy to the imperial titles of Europe. Even De Guignes, from whom we should have expected more care, applies the title indiscriminately to the

¹ Chap. lxxv.

sovereigns of China and to the great Tatar chiefs; and even in speaking of the wives of Kublai Khan, he says, "Il avoit épousé cinq femmes, dont plusieurs portaient le titre d'imperatrice." With these examples before us, we cannot be surprised that the translators of Eastern works deal in the same loose language, and are led into occasional inconsistencies. Thus the translator of the Travels of Ibn Batuta, following the received rule that, whenever the sovereign of Dehli is spoken of, the title must be rendered Emperor, applies it equally to two of these rulers, who are mentioned in a passage of Ferishta quoted by him; though in the original the title is *Padshah* in the one case, and *Sultan* in the other: while in the same passage, which only consists of eight lines, mention is made of a history of the *Padshahs* of Hindustan, where the title is rendered Kings, as is, also, that of *Malik* Toghlak, the father of one of these sovereigns.¹

I will add one more example of the carelessness of which I complain, and which I take from the Memoirs of Timur, translated by Major Stewart for the Oriental Translation Fund. It is in the list of the titles by which that great conqueror was described in the Khutbeh or public prayer after his election to the head of the state, and it is one in which we might expect some accuracy. It runs as follows:—"O Lord, assist the Muselman armies and camps wherever they are or wherever they may be, whether in the East or in the West, by the good fortune of the just Sultan, the illustrious Khacan, the renowned *Emperor*, the exalted *Prince*, the Khacan son of the Khacan, Amyr Timur Goorghan; may God perpetuate his dominion and government, and extend his beneficence and justice to all Muselmans."

We have here three of the titles which have been at different times associated with Imperial rule, *Sultan*, *Khan* or *Khacan*, and *Amir* (Commander), but we have nothing to indicate the equivalents of those which are in italics. There are other titles, besides those above mentioned, which have

¹ Travels of Ibn Batuta, Dr. Lee's translation, p. 125. It will be shown further on that the title *Malik* was in India one of honour only, and was not borne by reigning princes. This indeed is pointed out by this traveller in another passage.

been also borne by great monarchs, and I have found it interesting to trace them to their origin, as far as this was possible, to observe the higher significance that became attached to some of them with the progress of conquest or with the rise of new dynasties, and to follow them in their decline. In carrying out my inquiries the subject grew on my hands, and I thought the result would prove of interest to this Society, and I have accordingly thrown together a few remarks upon it.

Before entering upon the Eastern or principal branch of my subject, it will not be out of place to offer a short review of the imperial title in Europe itself. It has undergone great changes since it was applied to the commanders of the armies of a republic. It is associated with the military sway of the early Roman empire, and with the oriental despotism of the same empire in its decline; with the conquest of the Franks, and with a sort of half-feudal half-military commonwealth in Germany; with the rule of the Czars in Russia, and with the arms of Napoleon; and it has been applied to sovereigns, in still more modern instances, where its original signification has been quite lost sight of. It is interesting to trace these changes, and it is necessary to keep them in mind when we come to comment upon the rise and fall of Eastern governments to which the imperial title is applied. I will commence by tracing its history from its very source.

EMPEROR.

The military authority, to which the term *Imperium* was applied during the Republic, was as old as the Kings, and was conveyed by a special vote of the *Comitia Curiata*. This appears distinctly from Cicero's account of the election of Tullius Hostilius (*de Rep. ii. 17*), of Ancus Martius (*ii. 18*),¹ and L. Tarquinius (*ii. 20*). It was conferred by the same authority on the Consuls, or governors of provinces, and on all, in fact, who were invested with military authority. It appears, from an often-quoted passage of Tacitus (*Annals, ii.*

¹ "Itemque de imperio suo legem curiatam tulit." The same expression, slightly varied, is applied to each case.

74), that it was the ancient practice for soldiers to salute their generals, after great victories, with the title of Emperor, and that there might be many contemporary generals bearing the title. But in all these cases it was an official title, added to the name, betokening authority, which might be of a temporary nature. It is recorded by Suetonius, that among the excessive honours and titles assumed by Julius Cæsar, he took the *prænomen* of Emperor, thereby connecting it especially with his name.¹ It is well known with what caution Augustus avoided such outward demonstrations of authority. “*Nomine Principis sub imperium recepit*,” is the emphatic statement of Tacitus,² and it was as Princeps, or chief of the senate,—a dignity of the highest rank in the Republic,—that he and his immediate successors were habitually spoken of in contemporary literature.³ So little was the title Emperor especially associated with the head of the State, during the early period of the Empire, that Tiberius conferred it on his stepsons Tiberius, Nero, and Claudius Drusus.⁴ Blæsus had the honour of being the last Roman, not being one of the reigning family, on whom the title was conferred by the legions with the consent of the head of the State.⁵ From that time it was confined to the prince, or those associated with him in the government. On one memorable occasion, indeed, this honour was conferred on a successful general, not being one of the ruling princes; this was on the capture of Jerusalem. Josephus, after describing the burning of the Temple, proceeds: “And now the Romans, upon

¹ Suetonius, lxxvi. Non enim honores modo nimios recepit, ut continuum consulatum, perpetuam dictaturam præfecturamque morum; insuper *prænomen imperatoris*, cognomen patris patriæ, statuum inter reges, suggestum in orchestra; sed et ampliora etiam humano fastidio decerni sibi passus est.

² Annal. i. 1.

³ The personal appellation Cæsar was of course in constant use, and especially in addressing them. Thus Horace

Hic ames dici pater atque *Princeps*.

Neu sinas Medos equitare inultos,

Te duce, *Cæsar*.—(Od. i. 2.)

For examples of the use of Princeps I may refer to Juvenal, viii. 198, 226; x. 76, 93.

⁴ Tacitus, Annal. i. 3.

⁵ Annal. iii. 74: Concessit quibusdam et Augustus id vocabulum, et tunc Tiberius Blæso *postremum*.

the flight of the seditious into the city, and upon the burning of the holy house itself, and of all the buildings round about it, brought their ensigns to the temple, and set them over against its eastern gate; and there did they offer sacrifices to them, and there did they make Titus *Imperator* with the greatest acclamations of joy.”¹

Titus was not associated with Vespasian in the government until the following year, and this proceeding on the part of the troops was interpreted as implying a desire by the army to set up a separate government in the East. The suspicion which attached to Titus was augmented by his assuming a diadem soon after in Egypt, in a religious ceremony. Suetonius says there was nothing in this inconsistent with the ancient custom; “sed non deerant qui secius interpretantur.” Accordingly Titus hastened home, and rushing into his father’s presence, he exclaimed, “Veni, pater, veni.”²

Dion Cassius, referring to the time of Julius, takes pains to point out the threefold significance which had at different times attached to the title: that which was conferred after great victories; that which belonged to public officers invested with an independent command (*αὐτοτελή ἡγεμονίαν*); and lastly, that which it bore in his own time as connected with the highest authority in the State, and used as a proper name (*τι κύριον*).³

We find in Livy the title constantly applied to generals in command, but it is to the honorary title when conferred by the troops that Publius Scipio refers, as the story is told by the same author, when the soldiers showed a disposition to salute him as king, “Tum Scipio silentium per præconem facto, sibi maximum nomen imperatoris esse, dixit, quo se milites me appellassent, regum nomen alicui magnum, Romæ intolerabile

¹ Whiston’s Josephus, The Jewish War, c. 6.

² Various coins are extant connected with the fall of Jerusalem with this title applied to Titus, see the Numismatic Chronicle for 1876. The inscription on one runs: ΑΥΤΟΚΡΑ ΤΙΤΟΣ ΚΑΙ ΣΕΒ.

³ Dio. lib. xliiii. sec. 44: Τό τε τοῦ Ἀυτοκράτορος ὄνομα οὐ κατὰ τὸ ἀρχαῖον ἔτι μόνον ὡσπερ ἄλλοι τε καὶ ἐκεῖνος πολλάκις ἐκ τῶν πολέμων ἐπεκλήθησαν, οὐδ’ ὡς ὃ τινὰ αὐτοτελή ἡγεμονίαν ἢ καὶ ἄλλην τινὰ ἐξουσίαν λαβόντες, ἀναμύζοντο, ἀλλὰ καθάπαξ τοῦτο δὴ τὸ καὶ νῦν τοῦς τὸ κράτος αἰεὶ ἔχουσι διδόμενον ἐκείνω τότε πρώτῳ τε, καὶ πρώτῳ ὡσπερ τι Κύριον προσέθησαν.

esse.”¹ The honorary title conferred by the troops required to be confirmed by the Senate, and the privilege was zealously guarded. Of this we have an example in an incident in the second Punic war, when L. Marcius, after restoring the affairs of Spain, addressed the Senate as “Proprætor,” to which the imperium was attached. His letter began, “Proprætor senatui.” This appellation gave offence: “Rem mali exempli esse imperatores legi ab exercitibus.”²

There is much evidence of the value which attached to the dignity before it became associated with the head of the State. With an office of such high honour it is not surprising to find it on the coins of Roman families. Of this I find numerous instances in Vaillant’s Collection, but none which dates beyond the first triumvirate, and then it occurs frequently. That of Pompey is interesting from its simple dignity: Magnus Pius Imp. iter, “The great, the pious. Emperor for the second time.”

Those of Antony are various. In one he is associated with Julius, the head of each being given on either side, the inscription running M. Antoni. Imp. In another he is associated with Augustus, Antonius Imp. on one side, and Cæsar Imp. on the other, to denote concord.

I add one more of Antonius, marking another coalition, and the use of the title in Greek. Autocrator became the received translation of the Latin word. It was not originally confined to military authority. There were *αὐτοκράτορες πολεμικοί*, and *περὶ εἰρήνης*, also *πρεσβευταὶ αὐτοκράτορες*, ministers plenipotentiary.³ The inscription on the coin of Antony to which I now refer runs as follows:

M. ΑΝΤΩΝΙΟΣ ΑΥΤΟΚΡΑΤΩΡ ΤΡΙΤΟΝ ΤΡΙΩΝ ΑΝΔΡΩΝ

“M. Antonius, Autocrat, third of the three men (triumvirs).”

On the reverse:

ΒΑΣΙΛΙΣΣΑ ΚΛΕΟΠΑΤΡΑ ΘΕΑ ΝΕΩΤΕΡΑ.

“Queen Cleopatra, a new goddess.”

¹ Livy, xxvi. 2.

² Livy, xxvi. 2: “Titulus honoris (quod imperio non populi jussu non ex auctoritate patrum dato, proprætor senatui, scripserat), magnam partem hominum offendebat. Rem mali exempli esse imperatores legi ab exercitibus.”

³ Spanheim, de usu numismatum, vol. ii. p. 181.

On another coin of Antony, in which the name of Cleopatra appears, she is described quaintly as "The Queen of Kings, Sons of Kings." The full inscription thus: *Antoni, Armenia devicta, Cleopatrar, Reginar regum, filiorum Regum.*

Great importance evidently attached to the title during the civil wars, and it was occasionally conferred by the troops, without the sanction of the Senate, or its connexion with any great military success. In Vaillant's work I find several of the Cæcilian family connected with this period, two especially, who are referred to in the Commentaries of Cæsar, *De Bello Civili*. One of these, M. Metellus Scipio, retired to Africa after the disaster of Pharsalia, and was saluted with the title of *Imperator* by his army. Another curious instance is quoted by Rawlinson in his *Sixth Oriental Monarchy*. Labienus heard of the defeat of his friends while he was at the Parthian court, to which he was sent by Brutus and Cassius; and, dreading the impending proscription, he accepted a command from the Parthian ruler, and invaded Syria, assuming the title *Imperator*, and this appears on the coins issued by him. The inscription runs: "*Qu. Labienus Parthicus Imp.*" He was afterwards defeated by Antony's forces and put to death.

In the time of Augustus the sword appears in its myrtle sheath. The imperial authority was constantly renewed, and the title implying military command is merged in the old civil titles of the Republic. This reserve did not lessen his authority in any degree, for the proconsular power, which was exercised in the provinces, carried with it that of war and peace and unlimited command over the army. A single example of the imperial style will probably suffice. I give one late in his career, which appears on an inscription at Rimini: *Imp. Cæsar. Divi. F. Aug. Pont. Max. Cos. XIII. Imp. XXI. Tribunic. Potest. XXXVII. P.P.*, "The Emperor Cæsar son of the divine (Cæsar), Augustus, Pontifex Maximus XIIIth, Consulate XXIst, Tribunician authority XXXVIIth, Father of the Country."

The policy of Augustus was followed by his immediate

successors. The early Emperors guarded themselves against the assumption of the title within the city, and the *prænomen*, which roused the jealousy of the Romans when assumed by Julius Cæsar, was refused by Tiberius (Suet. iii. 26), and by Claudius (Suet. v. 12). The former is said to have often declared, "I am the master of my slaves, Emperor of my troops, and chief of the citizens."¹ The Abbé de la Blérierie, who has examined this question with great care, says that none of the medals struck at Rome give this title to Tiberius as a *prænomen*. He also observes that the elder Pliny, while speaking of the predecessors of Vespasian, never applies to them the title of Emperor, but he constantly uses it in addressing Vespasian and Titus; and the Abbé explains this on the ground that, as commander of the fleet, he recognized the Vespasians as his special chiefs. So, also, Pliny the younger addresses Trajan as *Imperator*, because he commanded the troops in the province of Bithynia under his authority.²

The same jealousy applied also to the insignia of office. The *paludamentum*, or military habit, was never borne within the city during the first two centuries and a half of imperial rule. Vitellius is described by Tacitus³ as parting with this dress and assuming the *toga*, at the instance of his friends, and at the very time when he was prepared to sack Rome, as a city taken by assault. In the opinion of the Abbé de la Blérierie in the same essay,⁴ Gallienus was the first to display the purple robe within the city. But this was in that period of confusion when the provinces were dismembered and the Empire brought to the verge of ruin by the military tyrants, each assuming the imperial title. Long ere this the command of the army was the foundation of authority, and the wonder is that the respect for the forms of the Republic should have

¹ Καὶ πολλάκις γε ἔλεγεν ὅτι δεσπότης μὲν τῶν δούλων αὐτοκράτωρ δὲ τῶν στρατιωτῶν τῶν δὲ τῶν λυσιπῶν πρόκριτος εἶμι.—Dio. 57.

² Mémoires de l'Académie des Inscriptions, vol. xxi.

³ Hist. ii. 89: Ipse Vitellius a Ponte Milvio, insigni equo, paludatus accinctusque, senatum ac populum ante se agens, quominus ut captam urbem ingrederetur, amicorum consilio deterritus, sumptâ pretextâ et composito agmine incessit.

⁴ Mémoires de l'Académie des Inscriptions, vol. xxiv.

lasted so long. The transition was gradual, and it is easy to trace the steps by which the title of Emperor overshadowed every other, and gave a name and character to a dominion which has lasted, in name at least, to our own time.

While republican forms prevailed, the title of king of course never appeared. It is said by the same French writer, to whose careful essays I have already referred, that the first Latin writer who made use of the title in addressing the Emperor was Statius. In some lines addressed to Domitian on his 17th Consulate, he says :

Longamque tibi, REX magne, juventam
Annuit atque suos promisit Jupiter annos.

Martial, though using very freely the words Lord and God, abstained from that of king during Domitian's lifetime. This reserve, it is said, was maintained by Latin authors till the fourth century. With the Greeks it was otherwise, and one of the results of the transfer of the seat of government to the Bosphorus was to bring into use the title of βασιλεύς, and sometimes that of παμβασιλεύς. Writers of the fourth and fifth centuries, and especially ecclesiastics, apply the title to the head of the state, but it is never assumed by the Emperors themselves. A curious passage from a Greek author, Synesius, addressed to the Emperor Arcadius, is quoted in the above essay. I give the translation, as it shows that the constitutional import of the title Emperor was maintained in the fifth century :

“The title of king is of modern usage, having been abandoned from the time of the extinction of the Tarquins. Hence it is that although we apply to you this title of honour, both orally and in writing, you, whether from intention or from custom, abstain from assuming it as something too proud and haughty. In your addresses to cities, to individuals, to public officers, or barbarian rulers, you abstain from the name of king, but take that of Emperor. This title means the general of an army invested with full power, just as Pericles and Iphicrates at Athens were imperial generals (αὐτοκράτορες στρατηγού).”

While these scruples prevailed regarding constitutional forms, the adulation of the Emperors went beyond what is recorded of despotic sovereigns, even in Asia. The outward form of worship of the Emperor, the refusal of which caused the martyrdom of the Christians, ceased with the conversion to Christianity; but the substance remained. The inscription on the Arch of Constantine records his delivery of the republic from the tyrant and his faction, by the inspiration of divinity and the greatness of his mind.¹ Dean Stanley, in his work on the Eastern Church, charitably assumes that in this the Senate ascribes his victory to Providence. I think we need not resort to such explanations with regard to a sovereign whose Christianity was of a dubious character, and whose coins, as pointed out by Dr. Stanley, bear the name of Christ on one side and the figure of the Sun God and the inscription "Sol invictus" on the other, and who, although abstaining from the ascent to the Capitol to return thanks to Jupiter after his victory over Maxentius, accepted on this occasion the title of Pontifex Maximus, a title which was also borne by his successors, and among others by Valentinian and Valens. Zosimus, who records this fact, adds that when the robe of office was offered to Gratian, it was refused as unbecoming his profession of Christianity. Zosimus is a writer unfriendly to the Christians, and his statements have been questioned by many writers, who were slow to give credit to the paganism of the imperial government during the rule of Constantine and his successors; but their arguments are summed up in an elaborate essay by the Baron de la Bastie,² who produces accumulated proofs, from existing medals, and from public monuments, that the title was borne by Constantine at a later period of his reign, and three years after the Council of Nice, when his orthodoxy might be supposed to be insured. I give it in full, as illustrative of the style of this period, and marking the transition from the Divus of the early

¹ Instinctu divinitatis et mentis magnitudine. The term divine instinct, is usually applied to oracular inspiration.

² Mémoires de l'Académie des Inscriptions, vol. xv.

Emperors to the new title of Dominus, which superseded ultimately that of Emperor :

D.N. IMP CAES
 FL. CONSTANTINO
 P.F. VICTORI. AUG
 PONT. MAX
 TRIB. POT. XXIII
 IMP. XXII. COS. VII
 PP. PROCOS. CONS
 HUMANARUM. RERUM
 DIVI CONSTANTI. FILIO
 BONO R.P. NATO
 M.P. XV.

I add another inscription in illustration of the preceding remarks, recording the restoration of a Roman bridge by the Emperors Valentinian and Valens. Each is Emperor, Cæsar, Pontifex Maximus ; each records the various territorial titles assumed by them or conferred by the Senate, a custom which came down from the times of the Republic, and was expanded in the way here shown, until it reached the height of extravagance in the time of Justinian :

DOMINI NOSTRI IMPERATORES CAESARES FL VALENTINIANUS
 PIUS FELIX MAX. VICTOR AC TRIUMF. SEMPER AUG
 PONTIF. MAXIMUS GERMANIC. MAX. ALAMANN. MAX. FRANC
 MAX. GOTH. MAX. TRIB. POT. VII. IMP. VI. COS. II. PPP. ET
 FL. VALENS PIUS FELIX MAX. VICTOR AC TRIUMF
 SEMPER AUG. PONTIF. MAX. GERMANIC. MAX. ALAMANN
 MAX. FRANC. MAX. GOTHIC. MAX. TRIB. POT. VII. IMP. VI
 COS. II. PPP. ET. FL. GRATIANUS PIUS FELIX MAX. VICTOR
 AC TRIUMF. SEMPER AUG. PONTIF. MAX. GERMANIC
 MAX. ALAMANN. MAX. FRANC. MAX. GOTHIC. MAX. TRIB
 POT. III. IMP. II. COS PRIMUM PPP. PONTEM FELICIS
 NOMINIS GRATIANI IN USUM SENATUS AC POPULI
 ROM CONSTITUI DEDICARIQ. IUSSERUNT.

The history of the first Roman Empire may be said to have closed with its division between the sons of Theodosius at the close of the fourth century. At the beginning of that which followed, Western Europe was overrun by the barbarians, and parcelled out among the Goths, Huns, and Vandals. From the death of Honorius in 423, to that of the last of the western Emperors, some fifty years later, the

authority of those who assumed the purple scarcely extended beyond the walls of Rome. The successor of Honorius was invested with the diadem and the purple by the Patriarch Helion in the presence of the Senate and under the authority of the reigning conqueror at Constantinople. The remainder of the line of phantom princes reigned under the authority and at the will of barbarian princes or their generals.

It shows how low the imperial dignity had now fallen, that neither Goth, Vandal, nor Lombard cared to assume the title which was associated with five centuries of Roman power. Procopius relates that Theodoric refused the title of Emperor, being content with that of king. But the very name of Roman citizen had now become a byword. Salvian, who wrote in the fifth century, says that it was repudiated and shunned, and the rule of the barbarians was accepted by the province. "Those who do not fly to the barbarians become themselves barbarians."¹ The title of Rex came again into use. Among some specimens of the early coinage given by Spanheim, two inscriptions run simply D. N. Theodoratus Rex, or D. N. Baduela Rex. Though they did not imitate the titles, they vied with the Eastern court in costume. Their kings appear on the coins decked with the tiara and breastplate, after the manner of Constantinople. So also in England the early Kings of the Heptarchy were content with the simple title of Rex, but at a later period the titles of Basileus and Imperator came again into use.²

Long ere this the Emperor had ceased to be a military chief who owed all to his army. In his coronation, indeed, the form was retained of raising him on a shield; but he was surrounded, not by troops, but by the great officers of state. They became the sovereigns, not of a camp, but of a court, dependent on foreign auxiliaries. Nothing illustrates the

¹ Gibbon, cap. xxxv. Sharon Turner's Anglo-Saxons, vol. i. p. 184. Spanheim de usu numismatum, eighth dissertation.

² A long list of these titles appeared in the *Athenæum* of April 8th, 1876, extracted by Mr. W. de Gray Birch from Kemble's *Codex Diplomaticus Ævi Saxonici* and other works. Imperial titles of every variety came into use latterly, but, from the beginning of the seventh century downwards, that of Rex was commonly used by all sovereigns without exception.

change more completely than the externals of sovereignty. The wreath of the early Emperors is exchanged for a diadem, and instead of the military paludamentum, we see robes of the greatest magnificence. The open assumption of the diadem is attributed to Dioclesian, though Caligula had used it on private occasions. Eutropius says of him, “*Diademate imposito dominum se appellari jussit,*” as if there were some special connexion between this oriental emblem of rule and the servile title. The same author says of Dioclesian “*adorari se jussit nam ante eum cuncti imperatores ut judices salutarentur,*” and speaking of the jewels which covered his robes, he adds, “*nam prius imperii insigne in chlamyde tantum erat, reliquaque communia.*”

Constantine wore the diadem habitually, and was curious in his selection of pearls and other precious stones, but the simple diadem was gradually increased until it swelled into the large and high crown which we find in later representations.

I close this part of my subject with a few examples of the titles employed in the styles of some of the Emperors of the later period. I take the first from the Civil Law. It is of Zeno (474 A.D.), and heads an Imperial constitution: *Ἀυτοκράτωρ Κάισαρ Ζήνων Ἐὐσεβῆς Νικητῆς τροπαιοῦχος ἀέλιμεγιστος ἀείσεβαστος*, “Zeno, Autocrat, Cæsar, the pious, the triumpher, always the greatest, always the most venerated Augustus.” I may add that of Justinian, prefixed to the Institutes, as an example of the extreme use of titles derived from nations subdued: “Imperator Cæsar, Flavius, Justinianus, Alemanicus, Gothicus, Francicus, Germanicus, Anticus, Alanicus, Vandalicus, Africanus, Pius, Felix, Inclytus, Victor ac triumphator, Semper Augustus.” That which is prefixed to the Code is more simple: “*Tituli codicis D. Justiniani Sacratissimi Principis PP.A.*” Notwithstanding the use of the modest title of Prince, the edicts and constitutions invariably appear with the heading of Emperor or Autocrat, or, according as they are in Latin or Greek, with an occasional use of Basileus, which came now to be used as the equivalent of Emperor. The imperial constitutions extend from

Hadrian to Justinian, and it is instructive to observe how completely the military authority is recognized as the fountain of law, and it is employed whether the edict be addressed to the prefect of Constantinople or to the archbishop of the same city.

The title *Basileus* comes into frequent use when there are successive edicts by the same sovereign; *ὁ αὐτὸς βασιλεὺς* is generally substituted for *αὐτοκράτωρ* in the succeeding documents. But at a later period *Basileus* almost superseded that of *Autocrat*. So much was it regarded as the special title of the rulers of Constantinople, that *Basilius* the Macedonian, in the tenth century, took offence at Pope Hadrian II. using the title *Basileus* in speaking of Lewis II., in a letter addressed to Constantinople. The title was ordered to be erased from the letter, and an embassy of remonstrance was addressed to Lewis. Selden records, at length, the special reply which was afforded to the Emperor of the East, but it amounts to nothing more than that there were many rulers in the world, besides the sovereign at Constantinople, who used this ancient designation.

I must pass over the long period which elapsed from the division of the Roman Empire between the sons of Theodosius at the close of the fourth century and the final extinction of the Eastern Empire in the fifteenth century, with a very few remarks.

If it was one of the aims of Constantine, in transferring the seat of government from the Tiber to the Bosphorus, to sever the government from the old traditions of the Republic, and lay the foundations of a new policy, it was most successful. The Court of Constantinople became a scene of frivolous ceremonial, encircled with grades of dignities which guarded every approach to the throne. "In this divine hierarchy (for such it is frequently styled) every rank was marked with the most scrupulous exactness, and its dignity was displayed in a variety of trifling and solemn ceremonies, which it was a study to learn and a sacrilege to neglect." This is the language of Gibbon, and for details

I need only refer to the graphic description of the state of the government as it existed in the time of Constantine, and again in the tenth century, in the seventeenth and fifty-third chapters of his history.

Illustrations of the change which it underwent are to be found on the coinage of the Empire. The titles of the republic passed away, and that of Dominus or δεσπότης gradually came into use and even took the place of Imperator on the coinage, and marked the increasing servility of the Court. Gibbon says that Julian refused the title of Dominus or lord, a word which was grown so familiar to the ears of the Romans that they no longer remembered its servile and humiliating origin.¹ In a note he refers to the life of Jovian by the Abbé de la Blérierie, who has traced the origin and progress of the word Dominus under the Imperial Government.² Still more curious is the history of the title δεσπότης, originally applied to the master of slaves, and so used in the expression of Tiberius that I have quoted above. It was afterwards applied to the Emperors, and is frequent on the coins of the later Empire. In the acts of the Council of Ephesus occurs the expression: "τὴν νίκην καὶ σωτηρίαν δεσποτοῦ τῆς οἰκουμένης." At the Council of Chalcedon the title of the Emperor Marcian runs: "δεσπότης γῆς καὶ θαλάσσης καὶ πάντων ἀνθρώπων ἐθνῶς."³

¹ It appears, however, on his coins.—Gibbon.

² The subject has also been treated very fully in one of Spanheim's Dissertations, and by Selden (Titles of Honour). Augustus issued an edict against its use, and Tiberius is also said to have repelled it. The compliments which were paid to them and to Trajan for rejecting it are duly recorded. The following, from Ovid, in his parallel between Augustus and Romulus, may be taken as an example:

"Vis tibi grata fuit, florent sub Cæsare leges.
Tu *Domini* nomen, Principis ille tenet."

And yet even Augustus, according to Dio, did not object to be addressed by the obnoxious title when it came from Cleopatra; χαίρει δὲ δεσπότης were the terms. A curious instance of the odium which attached to the title is recorded by Josephus: "The sicarii or banditti, who fled to Egypt during the troubles in Judæa, suffered every torture rather than address Cæsar as their Lord, Θεὸν δὲ μόνον ἡγήσασθαι δεσπότην."—Jewish War, book vii. From the time of Dioclesian the title comes into constant use, and writers of a later period use the term habitually in speaking of the head of government in place of the title Emperor. The third preface of the Digest of Justinian applies it to our Saviour, it runs: ἐν ὀνοματί τοῦ δεσποτοῦ καὶ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.

³ Ducange, Glossarium.

The term Despot, like other imperial titles, was subsequently conferred on members of the reigning family. Of the five titles, which in the tenth century were so conferred, Despot occupies the first place. They run as follows: 1. Despot; 2. Sebastocrator (a strange compound of Sebastos and Autocrator); 3. Cæsar; 4. Pan-hyper-sebastos; 5. Proto-sebastos. Selden proves very elaborately that the term was not, in the later empire, confined to the heir apparent, but was bestowed on other members of the reigning family. Subsequently it was assumed by governors of provinces, and thus we read of the Despots of Moldavia, of Servia, and of Bulgaria. Gibbon mentions that a member of the house of Angeli assumed the title of Despot in Epirus, and held it against the Latins; but this was at a time when Greek Emperors were reigning at Trebizond and at Nicæa.

From the time of Justinian, Christian emblems came into more frequent use, and mark the close connexion between the head of the government and that which was now the religion of the State. The alliance of the State with religion was always maintained during the Republic, and in the early Empire. The influence which belonged to the exercise of religious functions was zealously guarded by the Roman aristocracy, and the power of the Emperors would have been incomplete if they had not been invested with the same authority. When the head of the state became a Christian, he assumed the same authority of interference in the affairs of the Church, and we know how fully this was exercised by Constantine and his successors. They summoned and presided at councils, decided controversies, and made and unmade bishops, and the Church remained in complete subordination to the head of the State. The first Emperor that condescended to receive the crown from the hands of an ecclesiastic was Leo I. The fact is duly recorded by Gibbon, and animadverted upon as "the origin of a ceremony afterwards adopted by all Christian princes, and from which the clergy have deduced such formidable consequences."¹ Selden traces it no further than to

¹ Gibbon, cap. 36.

Justin, the successor of Justinian. From the authorities quoted by Selden, it appears that Justinian received the diadem from the hands of his uncle; but it is expressly recorded of Justin by a contemporary writer that he was first, after the old fashion, taken upon a shield, and so chosen by acclamation, and then crowned by the Patriarch. The custom so established prevailed till the close of the Empire.

As regards religious emblems, Constantine went no further than to introduce the Christian monogram XP. The Cross appeared soon after, and inscriptions expressive of Christian faith increased in number. Thus on a coin of Basilius I find *ΙΗΣΥΣ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΣ ΝΙΚΑ*. The word *ΕΜΜΑΝΘΑ* appears on that of John Zimisceus and others. On that of Alexius Comnenus the inscription is :

ΑΛΕΞΙΩ ΤΩ ΚΟΜΝΗΝΩ ΔΕΣΠΟΤΗ ΚΕ ΒΟΗΘΕΙ.

The first instance that I find of the head of our Saviour on a coin is in the case of Michael Rhangabé, in the ninth century; angels occasionally appear holding crosses and supporting the prince; subsequently the figure of Christ came to be introduced; in one instance the hand is raised over the head of the sovereign, John Porphyrogenitus, as if in the act of blessing; in another the quaint device is introduced of the figure of Christ, with arms outstretched in the form of a cross, and apparently blessing the Emperor and his consort. The sovereign is Andronicus Comnenus, in the twelfth century.

The figure of the mother of our Lord occasionally appears, either standing with outstretched arms, or bearing the infant Jesus on her knees. The inscriptions run: *Δέσποινα σώζοις*, "O Lady, save us;" or *Θεοτος Βοηθ Ρωμανω*; frequently we have merely the letters *ΜΡ ΘΡ*, that is, *μήτηρ θεου*, "Mother of God." Honour is also rendered to the saints. The Archangel Michael is invoked on a coin of Theodosius I. and other emperors. The inscriptions run: *ὁ ἅγιος μί* or *ἅγιος αρχ μί*. St. George appears on the coins of Alexius I. Comnenus, simply *ὁ Γεωργιος*.

These recurring appeals to divine aid mark the death

struggle which was carried on in the East between Christianity and the religion of Muhammad. The coinage of the Khalifs was also employed in spreading the dogmas of the rising faith. They abound in formularies and texts from the Koran, expressive of the unity and eternity of the Deity, and faith in the divine mission of Muhammad, and the same practice was adopted by subsequent Muhammadan rulers. According to Arabian writers, this struggle arose out of the epistolary correspondence between these great powers. The Khalif used to commence his letters with the Musselman formulary. Upon this the Christian sovereign took offence, and threatened to introduce Christian formularies on his coinage. The Khalifs accordingly resolved to be independent of any foreign supply, and make use of the new coinage to spread their creed. It is said that the faithful were at first scandalized by the holy name of *Allah* being profaned by impure hands.¹ The practice, however, prevailed, and the Christian formularies introduced in rivalry superseded, in a great measure, the Imperial and other titles of the rulers of Constantinople.

Religious feeling was not always predominant in resorting to these sermons on coins. Some of the early coins of the Muhammadans are bilingual, in Arabic and Greek, and bear the signs of the Cross. Commercial views may have had some weight in such circulation; for the resort to the emblems of a rival religion was not confined to the professors of Islam.

It appears from recent numismatic researches that the coinage of some of the Frank Principalities in the East, during the Crusades, was formed in imitation of that of the Arabs, and with the religious formula of the Muhammadans. This is the conclusion to which M. Lavoix arrives, in a memoir which is reviewed in a recent number of the *Revue des deux Mondes*, and it confirms the statement of an Arabian historian, that during the three years which followed the conquest of Tyre, the Franks continued to strike their money

¹ Marsden, vol. i. Introduction, p. xv.

in the name of the Khalifs, but that they subsequently discontinued the practice. Whether this coinage is attributable to the acts of Venetian merchants, who, to supply the wants of trade, struck coins in a form which was likely to prove current in the East, and of which there are other indications, or whether it was part of a policy of conciliation on the part of the conquerors, the fact throws a curious light on the relations between the Christians and Muhammadans in the middle of an intensely religious struggle. The amount of coinage thus thrown into circulation attracted attention and alarm in the West, and, upon the representation of Eudes de Chateauroux, the pontifical legate, who accompanied Louis IX. to the Holy Land, Innocent IV. issued the strongest censure against the practice, and confirmed the letter of excommunication already issued by his legate against the Christians of St. Jean d'Acre and of Tripoli, who struck besants and drachms with the name of Muhammad and the era of the Moslems. He further directs his legate to put an end to this "abominable blasphemy." It appears that another Pope, Clement IV., issued, somewhat later, an injunction against a similar practice by a bishop in the south of France, who struck coins *cum titulo Mahometi*, probably in imitation of those current in Spain.

The sequel of the story, as regards the coinage of Palestine, is curious. The manufacture of these Muhammadan coins was suspended; but to replace them a new coinage was issued, still in Arabic characters, but with the symbols of the Christian faith taking the place of those of the Arabian prophet. A sample of this new coinage is given by M. Lavoix, and it is curious to observe how the Christian formula of the unity of the Deity is made to contrast with those we are familiar with in the coinage of the Khalifs. This coinage was issued during the time of Louis IX.'s stay in St. Jean d'Acre, and M. Lavoix attributes to Saint Louis the act, which he stigmatizes as an act of sacrilege, of issuing Christian money under a Muhammadan type, but which may have been a pious device to give the widest circulation to the doctrines of Christianity.

As an example of this use of the weapon of an enemy, I give below the inscription on a gold coin, in Arabic, now in the National Collection, in imitation of the coinage issued by the Khalifs, substituting the Pope for the Khalif, and the Christian creed for that of Muhammad.¹ A representation of the same coin, with its inscriptions, will be found in the *Trésor de la Numismatique*. The era (Safar) named is that of the Conquest of Spain by Augustus B.C. 38.

I turn from this digression to the history of the Imperial Titles of Modern Europe.

¹ I am indebted to Mr. R. S. Poole, of the British Museum, for the transcription of this curious coin.

DÍNÁR (Gold Coin) OF ALFONSO VIII. OF CASTILLE. A.D. 1158-1214.

Obv. Area.

+

الإمام البيعه

المسيحية بابه روهي

ALF.

Margin.

بسم الأب والابن والروح القدس الله الواحد

ابن وتعمد يكن سلما

Rev. Area.

أمير

القتو القيين

الفنس بن سأكه

أيدة الله

ونصرة

Margin.

ضرب هد الدينار بمدينه طليطله سنة خمس (?)

وعشرين وماتين والى بالفصر

Size, 1 inch. Weight, 57 grains.

Obv. Area. The Imám of the Church of the Messiah, the Pope of Rome. ALF. Margin. In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost : whosoever believeth and is baptised shall be saved.

Rev. Area. The Amir of the Catholics, Alfons, son of Sancho ; God aid and succour him.

Margin. This dínár was struck in the city of Toledo, in the year 1225 ? of the Safar.

MODERN EUROPE.

The so-called Roman Empire, revived by Charlemagne, again restored by Otho, and only finally extinguished by the events which followed the battle of Austerlitz, differed as much from the imperial rule of Rome as modern society does from the ancient world, or the Roman legion does from the feudal militia. Its history is connected with that of modern Europe, and I can only briefly indicate the principles of its rule, and the changes it underwent at different periods of a history extending over 800 years.

That which specially distinguished it from the Empire of Rome or Byzantium was that the imperial dignity was something independent of the royal or other titles of sovereignty Charlemagne had acquired a great empire, which extended from the Elbe to the Ebro, before he assumed the title of Emperor and was crowned by the Pope. The Saxon Emperors owed their election to their extensive possessions, which were still further extended by Otho the Great, and, after successive interregnums, the Princes who were placed at the head of this great confederation were the sovereign rulers of hereditary states.

Its history naturally divides itself into three periods. First, the Carolingian. The second, from the revival under Otho to the accession of Maximilian at the close of the fifteenth century. The third, the period of Austrian ascendancy. These successive epochs do not admit of a precise definition, but they are sufficient to mark out the changes the empire underwent.

Under the first the revived empire had some claim to the inheritance of the old Roman dominion. The victory of Pepin over the Lombards, when he came to the rescue of the Pope, was transient, and he was content with the title and authority of Patrician,¹ which the Pope assumed the right of

¹ Ducange (*Glossarium ad scriptores mediæ ac infimæ latinitatis*) refers to a seal of Pepin bearing the inscription "Pepinus Imperator," but adds significantly, "Si genuinus est." The same authority quotes several instances of the title being applied to French sovereigns of the early dynasties, and among others to Clovis, in a life of St. Fridolin, and to Pepin, in an old Charter, which concludes with the words, "Actum Flaviniano Cœnobio, anno 17 Peppini imperatoris,

conveying, and which Pepin bore, together with that of King of the Franks; but under Charlemagne the rule of the Lombards passed away, and Charles became King of the Lombards as well as the Franks, and was crowned Emperor of the Romans at the hands of the Pope.

This revival of the Western Empire grew out of a religious schism, which divided the Western from the Eastern Church. The Popes shook off the authority of Constantinople, but still needed the protection of the civil arm. This they found in the orthodox Carolingian princes. On Charles's second visit to Italy, a woman reigned in Constantinople, and this afforded a favourable pretext for the act which was to inaugurate a new era. The scene was prepared with great ceremony. Charles knelt at the high altar, clothed in his dress of office, that of the Roman Patrician; the Pope placed on his head a crown of gold, and the Pope and clergy exclaimed, according to the formula in use for the Roman Emperors, "*Karolo Augusto, a Deo coronato, magno et pacifico imperatori, vita et victoria.*"

It is unnecessary to enter into questions whether Charles was passive in these transactions, and what was the precise legal or ecclesiastical effect of the change. One can hardly entertain a doubt that the whole scene was arranged between Charles and the Pope, during the visit which the latter paid to him at Paderborn in the previous year. What is important to point out is the character of the authority which was claimed, in the assumption of the new title. Theodoric, Clovis, Pepin, and Charles himself had accepted titles from the rulers of Constantinople, which placed them on a level with the Greek subjects, showing that the new rulers in the west had recognized some superiority in the title of Emperor over that of King. But the empire which was now revived was, in theory, not that of old Rome, but the transfer of the

3 idus Junii." There is no evidence of any formal assumption of the dignity by any of these sovereigns. The same author appends to his article on the use of the title in the middle ages a remark indicative of the loose manner in which it was employed: "*Ceterum, haud satis sibi constitere scriptores in hujusce tituli distributione, ut quid inde uti indubitatum hauriri liceat. Modo enim qui Imperator est dictus, is paulo post ab eodem Rex est appellatus; et vicissim; quod etiam accidit in Imperatricis titulis.*"

centre of authority from Constantinople to the court of Charles. It did not enter into men's minds, at that time, to conceive that there could be two Emperors; and the title, Emperor of the West, which even Gibbon employs, does not represent the significance of this act. The chancery of Charles is said to have adopted the titles and forms of the Byzantine court, and the dignitaries of his court were obliged to approach him with a submission that was unknown to the Franks.

The rulers of Constantinople were too weak to take umbrage at the act of Charles, whose power was now rapidly extending over the shores of the Mediterranean, and who is said to have formed designs of further conquest in that direction. Embassies were sent to his Court by successive Emperors, so frequent were the changes. Eginhard, in his life of Charles, gives an account of the arrival of ambassadors of Michael Rhangabé at Aix, and their recognition of the imperial title. "Nam Aquisgrani, ubi ad imperatorem venerunt, scriptum pacti ab eo in ecclesia suscipientes, more suo, id est, Græca lingua, laudes ei dixerunt, imperatorem eum et basileum appellantes." The use of the latter appellation was a more important concession than that of Emperor (see *antè*, p. 327), and it is not surprising to find, from another passage in Eginhard, that the act of the ambassadors gave offence to Michael and his successors. Eginhard adds that the magnanimity of Charles prevailed over the haughtiness of the Roman Emperors. The negotiations, however, dragged on, and they were not concluded until after the death of Charles. They are fully detailed in the "Histoire des anciens traitez" (Supp. au Corp. Dipl. vol. i.). The concluding act was a treaty, nominally between Leo and Charles, but really with Louis. The difficulty in regard to titles was solved, as it has been in other cases, by addressing each other as brothers. "Cum quo (Leone) Carolus pacem perpetuam hoc modo composuit ut alter alterius semper fratrem nominetur, et alter ab altero semper juvetur. Græcus autem imperator orientis, Carolus vero sui que successores habeant Romam cum toto occidente." The quotation is from Godefroi de Viterbe.

In crowning Charlemagne the Popes accepted a master who claimed the right of interfering with the election of the Popes, until the papacy threw off the yoke under Hildebrand and his successors. Even Hildebrand himself did not assume the title of Pope until the election had received the approbation of Henry IV. The corruption of the times justified this interference, and it was not until the Church had, in some measure, purged itself of the gross scandals which disgraced Christianity, that she commanded the influence which enabled her to place her feet on the necks of kings. It was as advocate of the Church, a title, in the first instance, bestowed by the Popes, that this right was asserted and freely used. The Church was in as complete subordination to the civil government as in the Eastern Empire. Charles, as head of the Christian states, summoned councils, settled questions of Church discipline, and decided controversies. Professor Bryce,¹ in his review of the state of the empire under Charlemagne, quotes from a capitulary, issued at a great assembly held at Aachen, in which all persons are summoned to swear afresh to Charles, as Cæsar, and it is especially explained in this document that the act involved new and sacred obligations, not merely to the Emperor, but to the service of God, the Holy Church, and to widows, orphans, or strangers, "seeing that the said Emperor has been appointed, after the Lord and his saints, the protector and defender of all such." But the ecclesiastical character of the new sovereign is sufficiently indicated in his public officers of State. High functionaries, entitled *Missi Dominici*,² were charged with the inspection of provinces, and held

¹ "The Holy Roman Empire," a work to which I am indebted in tracing the history of the empire during the middle ages.

² The extent of their powers are very fully illustrated by Ducange, (*Glossarium*, under the title *Missi*), in extracts from the Capitulations of Charlemagne, and from mediæval chronicles. The inquisitorial power was exercised over all orders of society, and extended to conduct and morals. "Inquirebant qualiter Episcopi, Abbates, Comites, et Abbatissæ per singulos pagos agerent; qualem concordiam et amicitiam ad invicem tenerent, et ut bonos et idoneos Vicedominos et advocatos haberent, et undecumque necesse fecisset tam regias quam ecclesiarum Dei justitias, viduarum quoque et orphanorum, sed et cæterorum hominum inquirerent et perferent," etc.

"De monasteriis etiam et ecclesiis inquirebant, ac potissimum de conversatione virorum et puellarum etc."

assizes for the administration of justice, and inquired into the discharge of public duties by Bishops equally as by Counts.

When the imperial power was revived under Otho, a great change had passed through the society of Europe, owing to the growth of a feudal system. The tendency was to disintegration; and this was nowhere shown more distinctly than in Germany—henceforth the centre of the Imperial system. Under powerful princes like Otho or Frederick Barbarossa, the empire was extended. Burgundy, Poland, etc., became fiefs of the empire; but in weaker hands the Imperial power existed only in name. Feudal princes became independent, cities and independent communities sprang up in Italy and Germany, while the dependent royalties fell away. It is surprising that the empire survived the shocks it received in its struggles with the Papacy, or during the anarchy of the great interregnum. From this it was saved by something of national feeling among the Germans, and from a sense of common danger, which led to the rally round the imperial throne.

During the second or feudal period the empire acquired the character and consistency of a great federal commonwealth. The crown was elective. This principle is traced to the practice of the ancient Germans, whose chiefs were chosen by the popular voice. When it was revived by the German States, it became vested in the chiefs, though the voice of the people was required to complete the ceremony. The power of the greatest magnates must have always preponderated over the mixed multitude of smaller princes, and the act of Charles IV., by which it became fixed in the hands of seven princes, probably only ratified that which was already the practice in these elections. The power of the crown was limited. No great act of war or peace could be executed without the consent of the constituent members of the Diet, viz. the College of Electors, the College of Princes, and the free and imperial cities. The three bodies sat separately, and the consent of each was required.

Such was the theory; but the vast and cumbrous machine obeyed the impulse given to it by the feudal system, and any

powerful sovereign, who could appeal to the warlike spirit of the age, was sure of a following in wars, which wasted the resources and occasionally broke the power of the empire. The Emperor naturally took the lead in the crusades. He was appealed to as the leading Prince in Christendom; he presided over great Ecclesiastical Councils; but Italy was the great field of his warlike enterprises, and the history of the three centuries which elapsed from the revival of the Imperial dignity under Otho the Great to the coronation of Charles IV. is that of a struggle, of which Italy was the centre. Gibbon says that from the memorable era when Otho, at the head of a victorious army, passed the Alps, two memorable principles of public jurisprudence were introduced by force and ratified by time. 1. That the Prince, who was elected in the German Diet, acquired from that instant the subject kingdoms of Italy and Rome. 2. That he might not legally assume the titles of Emperor and Augustus till he had received the crown from the hands of the Roman Pontiff. This is nothing more than saying that the power of the Emperors rested on the sword. They organized no system of government. They exercised no authority, except in countries occupied by their armies. In the confusion of these times, cities and republics rose to provide for order and government. But the Emperors held sufficient authority to prevent the rise of any powerful state. Hence arose the struggle of factions, which forms the most painful chapter of Italian history, and which rendered her for 800 years the prey of the stranger. Hence also the struggle with the Popes for power and supremacy, under which the Emperors occasionally succumbed. All this belongs to Italian history, and I only refer to it because through the connexion of the empire with Italy it was moulded into the form under which it is best known in modern history.

Towards the close of this period, says Gibbon, Germany was a monster with a hundred heads, and he adds, justly, that this anarchy was the inevitable consequence of the laws and manners of Europe. But the nations which were shattered by the feudal system were reunited under powerful

princes; and, with the growth of a system of standing armies, France and Spain became united and powerful states. In Germany, however, all the attributes of regal jurisdiction were held by the princes of the empire, and the German Emperor (again to borrow the words of Gibbon) was "no more than the elective and impotent magistrate of an aristocracy of princes, who had not left him a village he might call his own."

Throughout these successive changes the heads of this great empire claimed the inheritance of the Cæsars, and it was held, in theory, that the rule was a continuation of that of Imperial Rome. The titles of Imperator and Augustus were borne on their coins, and in public documents, and when the system was introduced of electing a successor during the lifetime of the reigning sovereign, the heir so chosen became King of the Romans.

The third period, into which I have divided the history of the German Empire, dates from the close of the fifteenth century, when feudalism was declining, and the monarchical system was in the ascendant. The connexion of the empire with Italy, which had been long on the decline, gradually ceased, and the Holy Roman Empire was confined, in theory as well as in fact, to the states which composed this mixed body, and which were chiefly German, though they also comprised some Slavonic communities.

This period is also connected with the rise of the House of Austria, a family which was marked by few members of striking ability or enterprise, but who, by a series of fortunate marriages,¹ acquired a preponderance in Germany and in Europe. It reached its highest culmination under Charles V., but was shaken by the wars which followed the Reformation, and destroyed the unity of the empire. From this time the wars in which the German or Imperial Princes were engaged were those of dynasties or rival powers, resting more on personal than on public grounds. Germany, divided by religion and wasted by the rivalry of

¹ *Bella gerant alii, tu, felix Austria, nube.
Nam quæ Mars aliis dat tibi regna Venus.*

its princes, was an incoherent mass, without any traces of national union, and the ancient empire disappeared amid the convulsions of the French Revolution.

It is deserving of notice that the outward forms retained something of the ancient Roman or rather Byzantine models. The electors were great officers of the Imperial household. The King of Bohemia was the Great Cup-bearer, the Count Palatine of the Rhine was the Steward, the Margrave of Brandenburg the Great Chamberlain, the Duke of Saxony the Great Marshal, the three Archbishops of Mentz, Cologne, and Treves bore the seals of the triple kingdom as Arch-chancellors of Germany, Italy and Arles.

These several functions were discharged on great occasions, even under Charles IV., when his power was at its lowest ebb. I subjoin the lines of Schiller, describing the coronation feast of Rudolph of Hapsburgh, as quoted by Professor Bryce, p. 231.¹

The Dukes and Counts inherited the names and functions of provincial governors in the late Roman period. German writers have been unwilling to allow the Roman origin of these titles, and have attempted to trace them to German sources; but the matter has been placed beyond question by the learning and research of Selden.²

¹ "Zu Aachen in seiner Kaiserpracht
In alterthümlichen Saale,
Sass König Rudolphs heilige Macht
Beim festlichen Krönungsmahle.
Die Speisen trug der Pfalzgraf des Rheins,
Es schenkte der Böhme des perlenden Weins,
Und alle die Wähler, die sieben,
Wie der Sterne Char um die Sonne sich stellt,
Umstanden geschäftig den Herrscher des Welt
Die Würde des Amtes zu üben."

² The Count or Comes, in its origin, was an officer of state under the Empire. The Emperors had select attendants of consular or praetorian rank, entitled *Comites* or *Amici*. They were of different grades, and constituted a sort of privy council. The whole body was entitled *Romanum Collegium*. Individuals were designated *Comes primi ordinis*, etc. Special offices were subsequently attached to the rank, as *Comes* or *Magister*, (for the word is used indifferently), *sacrarum largitionum*, *Comes rerum privatarum*, *Comes equitum*, etc., and lastly the name was connected with territorial jurisdiction. The *Comes* exercised his special office in a particular province, or became Count of the province, as *Comes Egypti*, *Comes Isauria*. *Comes* is also used as the equivalent for *Archon*, a title that fell into disuse, but was sometimes used in Anglo-Saxon times. Instances are given of the title appearing in the Acts of Ecclesiastical Councils, but its significance, as a terri-

With regard to the styles in use in these successive periods, those of Charlemagne run variously. The specimen which is given by Ducange (*Glossarium*, under the title *Imperator*) is the fullest, and runs as follows: "Carolus serenissimus Augustus, a Deo coronatus, magnus et pacificus imperator, Romanorum gubernans imperium, qui et per misericordiam Dei rex Francorum et Langobardorum." Several of the forms used are given by Selden; one of them, forming the heading of a charter of foundation to the Bishopric of Osnaburgh, corresponds nearly with the above. In another the title of *Cæsar* is introduced: "Imperator *Cæsar* Carolus, Rex Francorum invictissimus, et Romani rector imperii." On one of his coins he is simply "Carolus Magnus Roman. Imp. et Franco. Rex." Another, struck at Rome, marks his alliance with the Papacy. The obverse gives a rude figure of the Emperor, with the legend, "Carolo R. Leo PP.," the reverse, "S. C. S. Petrus." The inscription on a leaden seal, preserved at Paris, is given by Professor Bryce, expressive of the renewal of the empire. The legend runs: D.N. KAR. IMP. P.P. AVG. RENOVATIO ROMAN. IMP. ROMA appears at the foot.

Like the Roman Emperors, Charles associated his son with him in the government during his lifetime. This took place in his advanced age, and with a view to secure the transmission of the Imperial crown. At a great Diet at Aix the ceremonial was arranged, and after receiving from his father injunctions as to the proper discharge of his great duties, Lewis was directed to take the crown that was prepared and place it on his own head, thus denoting his independence of the Papal sanction; a precedent that may have influenced Napoleon when he renewed the empire of Charlemagne.

Lewis seems to have felt uneasy at this act of defiance, for when Pope Stephen came to Rheims to take a part in the

torial title, is traced by Selden to its being associated with that of *Dux*, a common designation for the lieutenants of provinces or frontiers, as, for instance, *Dux et Comes rei militaris Isauriæ*. The title, thus associated with high dignity in the Eastern Empire, rapidly extended in the West, and accumulated instances are given by Selden of letters patent creating the dignity, under Theodoric King of Italy. Counts were also created by Gothic Kings.

ceremony of his consecration, Lewis showed his reverence by prostrating himself thrice, and refusing to rise until the Pope took him by the hand. The whole scene shocked the councillors of his great father, and was a presage of what followed.

The empire underwent successive divisions in the civil wars which followed. The titles of Emperor and Augustus became the subject of treaties, and were assigned successively to his son and grandson. On the first of these occasions, that of the treaty of Verdun in 843, the empire was in reality abolished. France and Germany henceforth became separate kingdoms. The Imperial title, however, survived, and was the subject of a similar engagement on the partition which followed the death of Lothair in 853, but we almost lose sight of it in the confused times which follow.

Otho and his successors were content with the simple title of Emperor in their public acts. They held great hereditary possessions, but these were overshadowed by the imperial dignity, the seal of Otho containing the simple inscription, OTTO IMP AVG. The act by which he confirms the donations of Pepin and Charlemagne commences with equal brevity : "Ego Otto Dei Gratiâ Imperator Augustus, una cum Ottone glorioso rege nostro, divina ordinante potestate, spondemus et promittimus."¹ A confirmation of the same act by Henry II. runs in almost identical words, and I find the same simplicity of diction in imperial acts relating to Germany, and in the imperial constitutions. In one of these edicts, appended to the *Corpus juris civilis*, the name of the Emperor, Lothaire III., is followed by a string of epithets after the old Roman fashion, such as *pious, felix, inclytus, ac triumphator* ; but this is exceptional.

As feudal principles grew strong, and the personal authority of the Emperor declined, a pompous style prevailed, and the full territorial titles of the reigning princes were set forth. Thus the edict of Sigismund for the security of the Council of Constance commences : "Sigismundus, Dei Gratiâ, Roma-

¹ Supplement au Corps Diplomatique, vol. ii. p. 23, where reference is made to Baronii *Annales Ecclesiastici*, Tom. x.

norum Rex, semper Augustus, ac Ungariæ, Dalmatiæ, Croatiae Rex, universis ac singulis presentes literas inspecturis notum facimus.”¹ A more complete array of titles will be found in the treaty of alliance between the same sovereign and Henry V. of England, concluded at Canterbury in 1425. It commences: “Sigismundus, Dei Gratiâ, Romanorum Rex, semper Augustus, ac Hungariæ, Dalmatiæ, Croaciæ, Ramæ, Serviæ, Galliciæ, Lodomeriæ, Conranæ, Bulgariæque Rex, ac Marchio Brandenburgensis, nec non Bohemiæ ac Lucemburgensis hæres, ad perpetuam rei memoriam.”²

The change which the imperial style underwent was due, in a great measure, to feudal ideas of lordship of the soil, and we find the same process going on in royal and other governments. The Kings of the Franks and of the Angles introduced new styles expressive of their territorial claims. Even the Dukes and Counts whose titles belonged to the imperial system of Byzantium claimed the same relationship with the people. The seals of the Norman conquerors describe them as Kings of the Angles.

Those of the Plantagenets run in the same style, with the addition “Dux Normannorum et Aquitanorum.” The territorial title is occasionally employed, and in the time of Edward III. we find it fully established. I give a specimen of one of his coins bearing the inscription—

EDWARDVS DEI GRATIA REX ANGLIE DN AGITANIE.
GLORIA IN EXCELSIS ET IN TERRA PAX HOMINIBVS.

That of the Black Prince is in a similar style. It was struck at Bordeaux.

Edwardus Primus Genitus REGIS ANGLIE Princeps AGITANIE. XPC
VINCIT XPC REGNAT XPC IMPERAT.

This introduction of Christian symbols is frequently found on French coins of this period.

In Scotland, on the other hand, the old style of Rex

¹ Corps Diplomatique, vol. ii. p. 363.

² Rymer's *Fœdera*, vol. iv. part ii. p. 171. It will be observed that in these transactions Sigismund is only described as King of the Romans, and the same designation is also applied to him by Henry in the letter appointing persons to conduct him on his arrival. He is merely entitled King of the Romans and of Hungary. Sigismund was not crowned at Rome until 1433.

Scotorum continued in use, and was so employed by the Stuarts, until the union of the Crowns. The unfortunate Mary was known as the Queen of Scots, while her rival and adversary was Queen of England, France, and Ireland. When she issued coinage in the names of herself and first husband, they were described as King and Queen of the Franks as well as of Scots. Her son also remained King of the Scots after her death.

The earliest instance which I find of the addition of these territorial titles to the simple imperial style occurs in the case of Alphonso of Castile, the rival of Richard of Cornwall, an episode of the great interregnum. During their brief struggle, each exercised imperial functions, and letters of investiture were drawn up in 1258, in favour of the Duke of Lorraine, which commenced as follows: "In eterni Dei nomine, amen. Pateat universis presentem paginam inspecturis quod nos Alfonsus, Dei gratia Romanorum Rex, semper Augustus, et Castellæ, Toleti, Legionis, Galliciæ, Sibiliæ, Cordubæ, Murciæ, Giennii et Algarbii Rex, ad instantiam, etc."¹

Under the Emperors of the family of Austria the practice arose of introducing in their style, not kingly titles only, but every dignity attached to each separate principality, whether inherited or acquired. Maximilian added Germany to the list of his kingdoms, and this style was constantly used by his successors. Charles V., in his act of surrender of the Imperial crown to his brother Ferdinand, styles himself simply Emperor of the Romans; but his treaties and public acts run in the pompous style which came into fashion. That between him and Francis I. in 1521 may be taken as a specimen: "Carolus, divina favente clementia, Electus Romanorum Imperator, Semper Augustus, Germaniæ, Hispaniarum, utriusque Siciliæ, Jerusalem, et Indiarum ac terræ firmæ maris oceani, Archidux Austriæ, Dux Burgundiæ, Brabantia, Virtembergiæ, etc. Comes Flandriæ, Tiroli, Palatinus Burgundiæ, Princeps Sueviæ et Landgraviæ Alsaciæ,

¹ Supplement au Corps Diplomatique, vol. ii. p. 185. The document is said to be taken from the register of the time of Duke Ferry, preserved in the archives of Nancy.

etc. Marchio Burgoviæ, Dominus in Asia et Africa, universis presentes literas inspecturis salutem.”¹

I must spare the reader the recital of the dignities of his descendant, Leopold. In his cession of the crown of Spain to the Arch-Duke Charles Leopold in 1703, there are enumerated, in addition to the Imperial dignity, six kingdoms, one arch-duchy, ten dukedoms, four principalities, five counties; and he is, in addition, Landgrave of Alsace, and Lord (dominus) of the Slavonic March.² Throughout all changes the style is preserved of *Elect* King or Emperor of the Romans, while everything else refers to territory. The Empire, or rather, as it came to be styled after the time of Barbarossa, the “Holy” Roman Empire, retained something of its ancient prestige when the authority which belonged to the Imperial system had passed away. Propped as it was by the territorial possessions of the House of Austria, it maintained an outward semblance of grandeur, and sank when the power on which it leaned was shattered by the arms of the new Cæsar.³

That the House of Austria should have so long maintained its position as the head of the Empire has afforded matter for the comments of historians. The following nine reasons are quoted by Professor Bryce from the work of a German writer early in the eighteenth century, in explanation of this great fact :

1. The great power of Austria.
2. Her wealth, now that the Empire was so poor.
3. The majority of Catholics among the Electors.
4. Her fortunate matrimonial alliances.
5. Her moderation.
6. The memory of benefits conferred by her.
7. The example of evils that have followed a departure from the blood of the former Cæsars.

¹ Corps Diplomatique, vol. iv. p. 352.

² Corps Diplomatique, vol. viii. p. 133.

³ The well-known lines of Lucan, descriptive of the tottering condition of the Pompeian party, and frequently applied to institutions that have survived their vigour, are apposite,—

“Qualis frugifero quercus sublimis in agro,
Exuvias veteres populi sacretaque gestans
Dona ducum, nec jam validis radicibus hærens,
Pondere fixa suo est”

8. The fear of the confusion that would ensue if she were deprived of the crown.

9. Her own eagerness to have it.

It remains to add a few remarks on the assumption of imperial titles by sovereigns beyond the sphere of Carolingian conquests and in modern times. The success of Charles in founding a new empire led to several attempts to bring the title into use. It was largely employed by the Saxon sovereigns of England in the tenth and eleventh centuries, and also by some Spanish kings somewhat later. But it may be observed, with regard to these assumptions, that the title merely denoted a superiority over kings and kingdoms within certain specified bounds, and had no relation to the empire of either Rome or Constantinople. The title was used very much according to popular usage in the present day. When England became united under one sovereign, the title of Emperor or Basileus came into frequent use. Something analogous had, indeed, existed in the time of the Heptarchy. The title of Bretwalda, variously rendered "wielder of the strength of Britain," or "the widely ruling chief," was given to several princes wielding extensive power. Sharon Turner calls them war kings. In those early times the boundaries and extent of the dominions of the invading chiefs constantly varied. Kemble, in his "Saxons in England," gives reasons for supposing that the kings were more numerous than are comprised under the terms Heptarchy or Octarchy. The power of some of these chiefs extended over a considerable part of England. Bede mentions seven that ruled over all England south of the Humber. Egbert, the contemporary of Charlemagne, conquered the whole of England, and the Saxon Chronicle says expressly of him that he was the eighth king who was called Bretwalda. Athelstan, in a charter, styles himself Brutenwealde of all this island; the title is rendered in Latin, "Rex et rector totius hujus Britanniae insulae." But soon after this the styles and phrases borrowed from the imperial chancery came into frequent use.

That of Basileus had, indeed, been employed so far back as the seventh century. In the middle of the tenth century

it was frequently employed, either singly, or combined with *Imperator*. Thus Athelstan in 930 styles himself “*Basileus Anglorum simul ac imperator regum et nationum infra fines Britanniae commorantium.*” This ostentatious display of titles arrived at its full height in the time of Edgar, in the middle of the tenth century. This vain prince is said to have sailed with a great fleet to Chester on the Dee, and to have there received the homage of eight kings, Kenneth of Scotland, Malcolm of Cumbria, Macchus of Anglesea and the Isles, three kings of Wales, and two others who are not named.¹ Edgar ascended a large vessel, and stationed himself at the helm, while the kings took the places of the watermen, and rowed him down the river. The style employed by him is consistent with this episode in his history. In one of his charters he appears as “*Anglorum Basileus, omniumque insularum oceani quæ Britanniam circumjacent, cunctarumque nationum quæ infra eam includuntur, imperator et dominus.*”

These titles seem to have been employed very capriciously. In three charters by Edgar, in the year 967, given successively in *Kemble's Codex Diplomaticus Ævi Saxonici*, the King's style runs: “(1) *Ego, Eadgar totius Anglorum gentis primicerius*; (2) *Anglorum telluris gubernator et rector*; (3) *totius Albionis Basileus.*” The variety and combination which appear in the specimens collected by Mr. W. de Gray Birch are endless. Besides *Imperator* and *Basileus*, we have *Dominus*, *Rector*, *Monarcha* and *Monarchus*, *Coregulus* and *Curagulus*, and *Subregulus*; also *Primicherius* and *Archon*; and these strung together with epithets and phrases according to the taste of the scribes, such as *gratulabundus*, *industrius*, *imperiosus*, *sublimatus*, and *subthronizatus*. This heaping up of titles of diverse origin is a peculiarity of Oriental phraseology, which I shall have occasion to point out later on in this story.

The same style prevailed during the Danish rule, and was again employed by Edward the Confessor; but it was dropped

¹ Sharon Turner's *Anglo-Saxons*, vol. ii. p. 267. In a note it is said that the chief called Macchus subscribed himself *Archipirata*! The authority for this is Malmesbury, who says that he had seen this signature on one of Edgar's charters with this peculiar epithet attached.

by the Norman Kings, who contented themselves with the simple title of Kings of the Angles, with the addition of territorial claims, such as that of Lord of Ireland and Duke of Aquitain. While avoiding the title Emperor, the term Imperium remained in use, as applied to kingly rule, and no sovereigns in Europe asserted more strenuously their independence. The extravagant claims to universal domination which were put forward by the imperial civilians called forth a spirit of resistance. Thus William Rufus is said by Matthew of Paris to have told Anselm that he had all the liberties in his kingdom which the Emperor had in his empire, and in a charter by the same King to the Monastery of Shaftesbury, he uses the expression, "Ego Wilhelmus, rex Anglorum, anno ab incarnatione Domini 1089, Secundo anno mei imperii, omnibus meus successoribus designo."¹ Richard I., during his captivity, is said to have made some concessions to the Emperor, "sicut universorum Domino," which made it the more necessary for his successors to assert their independence; and when the Emperor Sigismund came to England to mediate a peace between France and England, the Duke of Gloucester rode to meet him with his sword drawn, and compelled him to acknowledge that he did not invade the prerogatives of the English Crown (*velut se contra superioritatem regis prætexere*). The assertion of the Imperial rule of the British crown by Henry VIII. is directed not against the authority of Rome only. This famous statute² begins: "Whereas by divers and sundry old authentick histories and chronicles, it is manifestly declared and expressed that this realm of England is an Empire, and so hath been accepted in the world, governed by one supreme head and King, having the dignity and royal state of the *Imperial* Crown of the same," and in the following section it is said that the statutes of the King's progenitors were framed for the preservation of its prerogatives "from the arrogance, as well of the See of Rome, as from the authority of other foreign potentates." It may be added that the first Parliament of the same reign went a step further, giving to the English Kings the style of

¹ Selden, *Titles of Honour*.

² 24 Hen. VIII. c. 12.

Kings and Emperors of the realm of England and of the land of Ireland.

The assumption of the Imperial title by some of the Spanish Kings was more precise and significant than that of the Saxon Kings of England, and forms an important chapter in Spanish history in the middle ages. Mariana says that several kings of Spain bore the title. I need only refer to the most important occasions. Ferdinand of Castile assumed it after his victories over the Moors in the eleventh century. Henry II. of Germany took umbrage, and complained to the Pope of the act, which withdrew the Crown of Castile from its dependence on the Empire, and was injurious to the authority of the Pope. The question was taken up by Hildebrand at the Council of Tours, where these matters were debated, and an embassy was sent to Castile forbidding the use of the title, under pain of excommunication. In the events which followed, the famous Cid is said to have taken a part, and led the Spanish forces to Toulouse, where an arrangement was come to decisive of the freedom and independence of the Crown of Castile.

The subsequent occasion on which the title was assumed is regarded by Mariana as of more significance, and the sovereign who took it is generally known in history by that designation. Alphonso, King of Castile, had claims, both on Arragon and Navarre, and being prepared to assert them by force, an arrangement was made between the latter prince and Alphonso, by which the King of Navarre acknowledged the Imperial rule of the latter. An assembly of the states of the Kingdom was held at Leon, and it was decided that Alphonso should assume all the marks of Imperial dignity. The title Augustus was added because he had as feudatories Kings of Arragon, Navarre, the countries of Barcelona and Catalonia, including that part of France which formerly belonged to Gothic Gaul. The coronation took place at Leon at the hands of the Archbishop of Toledo, and afterwards at Toledo itself; since which event the arms of this Imperial city have represented the act of coronation. Contemporary writers say that this

act had the approval of the Pope Innocent II. Mariana doubts whether any Pope would have offered such an affront to the German Emperor. The circumstances connected with the assumption of the title are, however, beyond all question, and Mariana shows that the style was employed at the time in letters addressed to the Pope, and speaking of the new Emperor as one of the most powerful princes in Christendom, and as entertaining a filial affection for His Holiness. Alphonso conferred the royal title on his two sons, and retained the Imperial dignity till his death, when his dominions were parcelled out among his sons.¹ The inscription on his coins runs simply, Alphonso VII. Hisp. Imp.²

I find no trace of any new assumption of the imperial title from this date till it became connected with the style of the sovereigns of Russia. It has long been a question whether the title *Tzar* or *Czar* was derived from the Roman Cæsar. When Vassili or Basilius first assumed the title of Emperor, pains were taken to justify this on the supposition that this old title came down from the old empire. Olearius, who visited Russia in 1636, in the suite of the embassy of the Duke of Holstein, alludes to this claim in the following passage :—“Depuis que les Muscovites ont sçû qu'on appelle Kayser celui qui tient le premier rang entre les princes Chrétiens de l'Europe, et que ce mot descend du nom propre de celui qui le premier changea l'état populaire de Rome en monarchie, ils ont voulu faire accroire que leur mot de *Czar* a la même signification et la même etymologie. C'est pourquoi ils veulent aussi imiter les Empereurs d'Allemagne dans leurs grand sceau, où l'on voit un aigle à deux têtes, mais avec des ailes moins deployées que celles de l'aigle de l'Empereur, ayant, sur l'estomac dans in ecusson, un cavalier qui combat un dragon.”

¹ Mariana, Liv. xi.

² Ducange, under the article *Imperator*, gives many illustrations of the use of the title in Spain from the charters of the princes of Castile. In the following extract, which is taken from Zurita in *Analibus Aragon*, it is employed in the sense of feudal superiority. “En el año de 1135 el rey Don Alonzo, estando en la Ciudad de Leon, tomo la corona e insignias del Imperio Como Imperador y monarcha de todo España, pretendiendo que los Reynos y Señorios della o eran suyos, o le devian renocer come a Señor Soberano.”

This writer takes pains to refute this notion. His argument rests mainly on the fact that the word is of old use in the Russian language, as the equivalent of king, and that it is so used in the translation of the Bible in the old Slavonic language.¹ Karamsin also referring, in his history, to the vulgar error of his countrymen, dwells on the same fact, and his authority should be decisive of the question.

The usual style of Vassili's predecessors had been *Velikoi Knez*, which is variously rendered Grand Duke or Great Prince. Olearius says that the reigning prince was addressed by this title at the time of his visit. Czar, however, had been in use before, and Karamsin informs us that it had been borne by several sovereigns, and among others by Jaroslaf II. and by Demitri Donskoi. The question attracted the attention of the learned early in the last century, when Peter made great efforts to obtain a formal recognition of the title by the great powers of Europe. Much stress was laid by Peter on the fact that the title had been recognized by Maximilian in a formal document. The history of this transaction, as related by Karamsin, is curious. The treaty, which was political as well as commercial, was prepared in Russ, and translated into German at Moscow, when the title Kaiser was substituted for that of Czar. The treaty was ratified by Maximilian himself by oath, and in the presence of the Russian envoys. Karamsin adds, that the original having been lost, Peter caused the German version to be published with a translation both in French and Russ. Many years afterwards Joseph II., on his visit to Moscow, desired to see the document to which so much importance was attached, and noted, with some interest, the terms in which Maximilian's ratification was inserted, adding, with a smile to the guardians of the archives, "Show that to the King of France;" for the Court of Versailles had long refused its recognition of the imperial titles of Russia.²

¹ Cyril, Apostle of the Slaves in the tenth century, was the author of this translation. He introduced letters which bear his name, and worked among the Chazares, then Muhammadans, and settled on the Danube.

² Karamsin, vol. vii. p. 66, and the note on this passage at the end of the volume.

It is clear from Karamsin's statement that Czar was never connected with Imperial dignity until the sixteenth century, and that it had been previously applied, not merely to the rulers of Russia, but to the chiefs of neighbouring powers, in the sense of King or Prince. Vassili succeeded in procuring a partial recognition of the title Emperor; hence the Russian ruler is thus addressed in letters to him in favour of Russian merchants by Philip and Mary, and by Elizabeth, as will be found in Hakluyt. This form of address was, however, steadily refused by "the Great Turk," and "the Polonian," because, as Selden informs us, on the authority of a contemporary writer, "neither of those princes would endure any new title on each other's letters." Selden adds that his successors styled themselves variously "Imperator totius Russiæ," or "Magnus Dominus, Czar atque magnus Dux totius Russiæ," etc., or "Dei Gratiâ, Imperator et magnus Dux totius Russiæ atque Romanorum Tartariæ regnorum," etc., clearly showing that the new style was not well established.

With regard to the origin of the title, the question is left in some obscurity. While the best authorities are agreed as to its non-imperial origin, there seems to be a doubt whether it is a Slavonic word, and Karamsin traces it back to the time of Nebuchadnezzar. He observes, "Ce mot, (Tzar) n'est pas l'abregé du Latin Cæsar, comme plusieurs savants le croient, sans fondement. C'est un ancien nom Oriental, que nos connûmes par la traduction Slavonne de la Bible, donné, d'abord par nous aux Empereurs d'Orient, et en suite aux Khans des Tatars. Il signifie, en Persan, trone, autorité suprême, et se fait remarquer dans le terminaison des noms des rois d'Assyrie et de Babylone comme dans Phalassar et Nabonassar." I must here leave the question. To make good this ancient descent, it would be necessary to find some link that connected together these remote epochs. I have met with no trace of its use in Eastern titles.

I must bring to a close this review of the history of Imperial titles in Europe with a brief reference to recent assumptions. The policy of Napoleon in adopting this title is intelligible. In reviving monarchy in France the child of

the Revolution necessarily separated himself from the royalty of the Bourbons. The Empire admitted of an alliance with the forms of a Republic, and especially a military Republic. It offered something of novelty and greatness, and was associated with the ancient military renown of the Franks. When, therefore, he swore to maintain the territories of the Republic, everything was arranged to denote a revival of the Empire of Charlemagne. The Envoys of the Court of Vienna, which had shown some hesitation in its recognition of the new empire, were received at Aix-la-Chapelle with great splendour. The tomb of Charles was visited, and donations distributed among the clergy, in the vain hope of propitiating their interest. The throne was surrounded with an array of dignitaries, in imitation of ancient precedents, and the titles of the new Marshals were arranged to mark the extended sway of the new conqueror. In his style he was simply "Empereur des Français," and when to this was added the kingdom of Italy, the inscription on his coins runs, "Empereur et Roi," or "Napoleon le Grand, Empereur et Roi." On his visit to Italy in 1805, coins were struck in imitation of the old Roman style. "Imp. Napoleon P. F. A. Rex It. The Emperor Napoleon, Pius, Felix, Augustus, King of Italy."

In the mean time the old German Empire passed away. By a public act Francis II. made a formal resignation of the Imperial dignity, releasing the States of Germany from their allegiance, and withdrew within his hereditary dominions as Emperor of Austria. New empires began to rise in the far West. When the French were driven from St. Domingo, Dessalines, the chief of the new Negro Government, established in 1804, received the title of Emperor, as if in mockery of the new Government of France. But as Empire had been associated with revolution, and the changes in the French dominion in the far West were effected by the sword, it is not surprising to find another empire rise in Mexico.

Augustin Iturbide, a young man without rank or wealth, rose to power in the struggles between the royalist and constitutional parties in that country in 1822, and was saluted

by his soldiers with the title of Emperor, after the old Roman fashion. He had commenced his career as a supporter of the Spanish party, and sought, probably with sincerity, to secure the independence of Mexico under a Spanish Prince. When, however, he had established his authority over the whole country, he assumed the government under this ancient title, and with a view of reconciling the constitutional party to the new rule, he introduced the novel title of Constitutional Emperor. The inscription on his coins runs: "August. Dei. Prov. Mex. I. Imperator Constitut."

The empire was of short duration, but it is curious to note that the same year marked the rise of another constitutional Empire in Brazil. Iturbide assumed the government in May, 1822, and in October of the same year, when Brazil was declared an independent State, Don Pedro, of Braganza, adopted the title of Emperor of the new government, and assumed a similar style. His coins bear the inscription: "Petrus D. G. const. Imp. et perp. Bras. Def."

I think it unnecessary to refer to more recent assumptions of the title either in France or Mexico. The frequency with which the title has been assumed in recent times, and by minor states, and the ephemeral character of the rule of some of the governments so formed, has served to discredit the title, as if it were assumed for tawdry show, and inconsistent with the simple dignity of a great sovereign.

In Germany a new Empire has arisen which aims to unite the Teutonic race in one great confederation. But the events out of which this great power has arisen are too recent for comment, or for speculation on the probability of its duration.

EASTERN TITLES.

In examining the titles of Eastern sovereigns, we are, in the first place, struck by their variety; and, secondly, by the different significance which has attached to some of them at various epochs. The title King, and its equivalent in the languages of the North and South of Europe, has always been associated with supreme and independent power. Popes

and Emperors have claimed certain rights of superiority, and have made and unmade Kings, but this has not materially affected the course of history; and a kingdom or royalty denotes independence of internal administration, in spite of occasional exceptions, as much now as it did in early times, and the meaning directly connected with the name is not affected by the question whether the sovereignty be absolute, or tempered by constitutional checks.

In the East it is different. The titles are various, as *Malik*, *Sultan*, *Shah*, or *Khan*, differing in linguistic origin, and also in the importance attached to each at different times. Thus, the title Sultan was, so far as it can be traced, applied, originally, to subordinate governors only; but, when adopted by powerful sovereigns, acquired a dignity and popularity which led to its being assumed by princes small and great, till, in the end, it gradually dropped out of use and was superseded by new titles. So also *Malik*, long connected with sovereigns of the highest rank, has now ceased to be used, and may be fairly said to be obsolete. The title *Khan*, once borne by the greatest princes, has no longer the significance it once had.

These and other titles are frequently joined together in a way, at first sight, somewhat perplexing, the perplexity being increased when we find these royal designations used as proper names. Thus *Malik Shah*, the son of *Alp Arslan*, and *Miran Shah*, the son of *Timur*, bore names expressive of royalty; while the title usually applied to the head of the government was different, *Sultan* in the one case, and *Amir* in the other.¹ *Malik Shah*, on the death of his father, had the title of *Sultan* especially confirmed to him by the reigning *Khalif*, emblematic, as this was, both of honour and authority. But, at this period of history, the title of *Malik* also denoted rule, and was conferred by the family which ruled in *Egypt* on dependent princes.

The famous *Saládin* bore the title of *Sultan* as well as

¹ *Mir Miran* is the Persian corruption of *Amir il Omra*, and was applied to governors of provinces.

Malik. His full title,¹ as it appears on his coins, runs: "The Malik, the Defender (of the Faith), Joseph the son of Job, Sultan of Islam and of the Moslems, pure in the world and in religion." This combination of titles is not uncommon.

This fashion belongs to modern times. In the most ancient inscriptions of which we have records, sovereign princes, in recording their conquests and dominions, were content with simple designations, such as the great king, the king of kings, followed, however, by high-sounding epithets and phrases, expressive of their dignity and power. Such was the style of the ancient kings of Assyria and Persia, and these particular expressions are constantly used by the Greek and Parthian dynasties which rose to power on their ruins.

With the rise of the Muhammadan power a great change took place. The Khalifs were content with the simple title of Commander of the Faithful. But the new governments, that owned their supremacy or succeeded them, introduced new titles; and, as Asia was overrun, successively, by Arabs, Turks, and Moguls, titles which took their rise with these different races spread over the continent, and were frequently mixed together, as if it were the object of the prince to exalt his dignity by borrowing every designation that had ever been employed to represent royal authority. This practice arrived at the highest pitch of extravagance under the Turkish rulers of Constantinople, of which some examples are given further on. For the present I will take as example the inscription on the minaret near Ghazni, raised by direction of the great Mahmud, and that on his tomb, both of which are given in Mr. Thomas's Essay on the coins of the Kings of Ghazni.² The former runs as follows: "In the name of God the most

المالك الناصر يوسف بن أيوب سلطان الاسلام والمسلمين صالح¹
الدنيا والدين. I feel a difficulty in translating the word *Salih*, from its reference to the world as well as religion. In the dictionaries it is rendered rectitude, probity, or *status integer, bonus*. If the name were Salah-ed-din alone, it would bear the meaning which a friend has suggested to me of whole or sound as to religion.

² Journ. R.A.S. Vol. XVII. p. 161.

merciful. The high and mighty Sultan, Malik of Islam, the right arm of the State, trustee of the faith, the victory-crowned, the patron of Moslems, the aid of the destitute, the munificence-endowed, Mahmúd, (may God glorify his testimony), son of Sabaktagin, the champion of champions, the Amir of Moslems,¹ ordered the construction of this lofty of loftiest of monuments, and of a certainty it has been happily and prosperously completed." The inscription on the tomb of Mahmúd is more simple: "May there be forgiveness of God upon the great Amir, the Lord,² Nizam-ed-din³ Abúl Kasim Mahmúd, son of Sabaktagin. May God have mercy upon him!" We have here not merely the royal titles of Malik and Sultan, but those of inferior dignities, as Amir and Syud, and also those high-sounding religious titles which were conferred by the Khalifs, as the fountain of honour, on princes that acknowledged their authority. They were also very commonly assumed by persons of rank, and even by those of inferior authority, to mark their zeal for the faith.

M. Reinaud says, in his Introduction to the Geography of Abulfeda, that it was the custom of the day among Muhammadans for a child to receive a certain name on his circumcision, and to assume, when he grew up, another, expressive of his devotion to the faith. Thus the first name of Abulfeda was Ismael, while his first religious title was *Emad-ed-din*. When he became a prince, he bore successively the titles of *Malik Mowayed*, the well-supported prince, and *Malik Salih*, the excellent prince. Abulfeda, in his history, describes a visit he paid, in company with his uncle, to the reigning prince in Egypt, in which his uncle, who bore the title of *Al Mansúr*, the defended (of God), expressed a wish to give it up, in consequence of its having been assumed by the prince himself. This title was

¹ The expression in the original is *Amir il Mumenin*, Commander of the Faithful, the title of the Khalifs.

² The Sayud.

³ This is not one of the titles conferred by the Khalif. They appear in the preceding translation. The original is *Yemin ud dawlut Amir al Millat* (يمين الدولة وامير الملة). Vide Briggs's *Ferishta*, vol. i. p. 36.

popular with the sovereigns of the Mamluk dynasty here referred to, and was borne by the chief of Hamath, Abulfeda's uncle, whose title runs *il Malik al Mansur*. The scruple evinced on this occasion is intelligible, when we find how frequently Muhammadan sovereigns were known to their contemporaries and to history by their religious titles. A very large number of the Patan rulers in India are best known by these designations. Thus we have *Kutb ed-din*, pole of religion; *Shums ed-din*, sun of religion; *Jelal ed-din*, glory of religion, etc. They had also their proper names and titles of sovereignty. The extent to which this was carried is illustrated by Mr. Thomas, in his Essay on the Coins of the Kings of Ghazni,¹ where the seven sons of A'iz-ud-din Hasan figure with these especial titles. Of the four sons of Timur, three are designated by their zeal for the faith. *Gheith ed-din*, *Muez ed-din*, *Jelal ed-din*, signifying the aid, the stronghold, and the glory of religion. This will be more fully illustrated as I proceed with the various titles I have undertaken to review.

Notice will be taken of the very sparing use of territorial assumptions. In modern usage a sovereign prince is said to rule over a country rather than over a nation, though to this there are some exceptions. In ancient history we find the title variously connected with the country, with the seat of government, or with the people. In the Hebrew Scriptures Sennacherib is described as King of Assyria, Nebuchadnezzar as King of Babylon, and Belshazzar as King of the Chaldeans. We also read in Scripture of Cyrus, King of Persia, and Darius the Mede, while the King of Egypt is always spoken of as connected with his dominions. We have specimens of each of these forms in the inscribed records of ancient Assyria, Persia and Egypt.

In that of Darius, on the rock at Behistun, he describes himself as King of Kings, King of Persia, and also King of a long list of conquered countries; but, as a general rule, there is, in ancient records, an absence of anything like a definition

¹ Journ. R.A.S. Vol. XVII. p. 192.

of the limits or extent of the sovereign's dominions, as inconsistent with the arrogance of the claim to be King of Kings, or Lord of the world.¹

In modern Eastern history we have the same varied modes of expressing sovereignty; it is, however, common to find the sovereign described as the Amir or Sultan, as the case may be, of the seat of his government. In coins it is very rare to find any mention of territorial sovereignty; and with the rise of Islam it became the rule to set forth professions of faith, texts from the Koran and religious titles, all expressive of a great religious movement, that left scanty room for the personal or territorial claims of the ruler.

As a specimen of the variety of style in use at the same time, I quote from the *Malfusat-i-Timuri* the reasons which were employed to urge that great conqueror to the invasion of India. They are given in the form of a speech from his son Shah Rukh:—"I have seen," he says, "in the history of Persia, that, in the time of the Persian Sultans, the King of India was called *Dárái*, with all honour and glory; on account of his dignity, he bore no other name; and the Emperor of Rome was called *Cæsar*, and the Sultan of Persia was called *Kísrá*,² and the Sultan of the Tatars, *Khacan*, and the Emperor of China, *Faghfur*; but the King of Irán and Túrán bore the title of *Shahinshah*, and the orders of the *Shahinshah* were always paramount over the princes and *Rajas* of Hindustan, and praise be to God that we are at this time *Shahinshah* of Irán and Túrán, and it would be a pity that we should not be supreme over the country of Hindustan." Timur is said to have been highly pleased with the address, whereupon another of the Princes adds: "The whole country of India is full of gold and jewels," and, after proceeding at length in this strain, he concludes: "Now, since the inhabitants are chiefly polytheists, and infidels, and wor-

¹ In the collection of these monuments, published in the "Records of the Past," Shalmaneser is variously described as "King of the four races" (vol. i. p. 13), and "King of multitudes of men," "King of the four zones of the Sun" (vol. v. p. 29). This is obviously an assertion of universal dominion. May not this be the prototype of the *Ἄναξ ἀνδρῶν* of Homer?

² Khosru.

shippers of the Sun, by the order of God and his Prophet, it is right for us to conquer them." And so the invasion of India was resolved upon.¹

MALIK.

I will commence my review of these titles with that which bears the stamp of the highest antiquity, which has come down to us from the time of Melchizedek, King of Salem, and is the ordinary designation of kings or rulers in the Hebrew Scripture. From the same root we have the names of the god of the Ammonites and of other nations bordering on Palestine, as *Moloch* or *Malcham*.² It was the title of the monarchs of Assyria and of the Sassanian dynasty of Persia. The same root in its passive form becomes at once the designation of a slave (*Mamlúk*), and the title of sovereignty borne by a dynasty which ruled in Egypt. It is the ordinary Arabic designation of king or ruler, and is used as such by the Arabian historians of the Crusades, though with Eastern sovereigns of this period it was generally combined with the novel title of Sultan, by which it was finally superseded. The noun formed from the same root, *Múlk*, kingdom, continued to be used in royal edicts, and is in common use in this sense to the present day. But the title *Malik*, king, has passed away, and has only been applied for several centuries as a proper name, or in the sense of pro-

¹ Elliot's *Historians of India*, vol. ii. p. 396.

² It is variously rendered Molech or Moloch, Milcom, or Malcham. Another variety appears in 2 Kings xvii. 31, where the Sepharvites are described as burning their children in fire to Adrammelech and Annamelech, the gods of Sepharvaim. The word Malcham is sometimes rendered, in the Authorized Version, "their King," as in the account of Job's expedition against the Ammonites, 1 Chron. xx. 2. On this occasion David takes the crown of "their King" from off his head. It weighs a talent of gold, and is set on David's head. In the Hebrew *Malcham* occurs, and in the Septuagint *Μολχομ*. So also Zephaniah i. 5, where the translation is open to similar doubt. (Selden de Diis Syris, in re Moloch.) The connexion between Moloch and Baal seems well established, and as Baal, like Moloch, is interpreted prince, there is an identity of title as well as of rites. The Carthaginians, as also the Phœnicians, were said by the ancients to worship *Χρόνος* or Saturn. Human sacrifices were common to all. We accordingly find the title Bal commonly affected by the Carthaginians, and forming part of the name by which Hannibal and others are known to history; but Malik is also used, as in the case of Hannibal's father, Hamilkar. According to Gesenius (Phœn. Monum., p. 407), the former means "the grace and favour of Baal," the latter "the gift of Melkarth" (king of the city), the tutelary deity of the Tyrians.

prietor of land ; its derivative, too, *Malikana*, as a revenue term, being well known to public servants in India.

Such is the history of this once famous title. I shall proceed to give some examples in illustration of its history.

Malik is rendered king in the Authorized Version, and is to be found in compounds, as Abimelech, son of a king, a title of the Philistines, and Melchizedek. *Adonai*, which is rendered κύριος, lord, is also applied to kings, and used as a term of respect ; and we also have it as a term implying ruler, as *Adonibezek*, lord of Bezek. When the monarchy was revived under the Maccabees, the title of Malik came again into use. The earliest of this race who coined money were content with expressions of their faith, such as “ the redemption of Zion,” or “ Jerusalem the holy ;” but when the royal title was assumed, the name and superscription appear on the coins. The form is that of *Hammalek*, with the definite article prefixed.

In the Assyrian inscriptions the term *Sar* seems to be in more frequent use. In Mr. H. F. Talbot’s translation of the inscriptions of Sennacherib, and also in Rawlinson’s translation of the Eirs-i-Nimrud inscription, a third term is given, *ribitu*.¹ I insert from Norris’s Assyrian Dictionary his remarks on the use of these words : “ Malik, Malku ; monarch, king, ruler (Heb. מַלְכָּךְ). Malki, Maliki ; monarchs, kings, rulers ; Malkut, kingdom. Sar invariably follows the kings’ names, as the royal title Malik often appears upon other occasions, but with the same meaning apparently ; but I usually put ‘ monarch ’ or ‘ ruler ’ when the two words occur in the same sentence.”

I infer from these remarks that no question arises among Assyrian scholars at present as to the phonetic value of these terms, as was the case when their studies were young, and that the term Malik may be accepted as one of those betokening sovereignty in that empire. We do indeed find the term applied in one instance in the Hebrew Scriptures to an Assyrian prince, but it is there used as the proper name

¹ Journ. R.A.S. Vol. XIX. p. 135 ; Vol. XVIII. p. 42.

of the son of Sennacherib, *Adramelek*. I do not find any instance in the examples given by Norris, and in others that have appeared, of the two titles being joined together, as was the usage in later Asiatic monarchies. Each term has a distinct signification. *Sar Sarin* is the equivalent of King of Kings, and appears in Talbot's version of the inscription of Darius.¹

In the Sassanian inscriptions we proceed upon surer ground, as we not merely have the aid of bilingual inscriptions in the Greek and Persian languages, but the phonetic signs are limited to a moderate alphabet; and although there is some obscurity as to the value of certain letters, there is apparently little doubt as to the general tenour. *Mulka* and *Mulkan mulka* are the terms employed for King and King of Kings, upon coins, seals, and inscriptions. For examples, I refer to Mr. Thomas's paper in the third volume of our Journal (New Series). The usual title runs King of Kings of Iran, that is, of the Arians, or King of Kings of Iran and Aniran. The former is a singular limitation of sovereignty. To be King of Kings of Iran only is a great falling off from the claims of the ancient Kings of Persia to be Kings of the whole Earth. This higher title may be included in the latter instance, if we take Aniran to mean the non-Arian race. But the bare title of King of Kings had lost the importance which had once belonged to it, owing to its being used by sovereigns of inferior power, such as the Kings of Parthia, Bactriana, etc. There was no want of assumption of regal or divine attributes by the Sassanian monarchs, and they vied with the Byzantine monarchs in the use of high-sounding titles and epithets. I will take as an example No. 4 of Mr. Thomas's translations, because it includes the two forms noted above, and Sapor claims a wider rule than that enjoyed by his father. The inscription is on one of the bas-reliefs transcribed by Niebuhr and other travellers. It runs thus: "Image of the person of (or) mazd worshipper, divine SHAH-PŪHR, King of Kings of Iran and Aniran, of celestial origin from God, the son of (or) mazd worshipper, divine ARTAH-

¹ Journ. R.A.S. Vol. XIX. p. 262.

SHATR, King of Kings of Iran, of celestial origin from God, the son of divine ΠΑΡΑΚ, King.”¹

I am tempted to add another specimen of Sassanian titles, because it illustrates the rivalry of rulers of this epoch in the use of epithets. They were moderately used by Greek sovereigns in Syria and Egypt, and were adopted by the Parthian rulers. They were multiplied in the Roman empire in its decay, and the following list of epithets is employed by Khusru Núshirwan in addressing Justinian, one of the greatest offenders in this respect (see the specimen which I have given above, page 326). The passage is quoted by Mr. Thomas, in his paper on Sassanian inscriptions before referred to, from Menander, de legionibus Romanorum ad gentes. “The divine, the good, the peace-preserver, the ancient Khusru, King of Kings, the fortunate, the pious, the good worker, to whom the gods have given great fortune and a great kingdom, giant of giants, who is distinguished by the gods, to Justinian Cæsar our brother.”²

Some of the epithets, it will be observed, are identical with those in use in the Roman empire.

When the Sassanian empire was overthrown by the Arabs, their titles perished with them. The head of the new state was but one of many Amirs (commanders), but he was the Commander of the Faithful, and appointed the generals of the armies and governors of conquered provinces. The term Malik, though not applied to the head of the government, continued in use as expressive of rule, and will be found to be used in this sense in the history of the Crusades. It is also used as a proper name, and was borne by several Arab

¹ The translation which is given by Mr. West in the fourth volume of our Journal (New Series), p. 363, differs but slightly from the above. The Greek of the 4th Inscription runs as follows:

ΤΟ ΠΡΟΣΩΠΟΝ ΤΟΥΤΟ ΜΑΣΔΑΣΝΟΤ ΘΕΟΤ ΣΑΠΡΟΤ
 ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΝ ΑΡΙΑΝΩΝ ΚΑΙ ΑΝΑΡΙΑΝΩΝ ΕΚΓΕΝΟΤΣ
 ΘΕΩΝ υιου ΜΑΣΔΑΣΝΟΤ ΘΕΟΤ ΑΡΤΑΞΑΡΟΤ
 Βασιλεωσ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΝ ΑΡΙΑΝΩΝ ΕΚΓΕΝΟΥσ θεων
 ΕΚΓΟΝΟΤ ΘΕΟΤ ΠΑΠΑΚΟΤ ΒΑΣΙΛΕωσ.

² ἡ δὲ τοῦ Περσῶν βασιλέωσ γράμμασι μὲν' ἐγράφη Περσικοῖσ, τῆ δὲ Ἑλληνίδι φωνῇ κατὰ ταῦτα δῆπουθεν ἰσχύει τὰ ρήματα “Θείος, ἀγαθός, εἰρηνοπάτριος, ἀρχαῖος χοσρόης, βασιλεὺς βασιλέων, εὐτυχής, εὐσεβής, ἀγαθοποιός, ὧτινι Θεοὶ μεγάλην τύχην καὶ μεγάλην βασιλείαν, δεδώκασι, γίγας γιγάντων, ὃς ἐκ θεῶν χαοακταρί-ζεται, Ἰουστινιανῷ Καίσαρι, ἀδελθῷ ἡμετέρῃ.”

writers of eminence, and especially by a celebrated doctor who lived in the second century of the Hejra. Malik ben Nasr, an ancestor of Muhammad, is said to have visited the court of Sapor, the third Sassanian monarch of that name, and to have deprecated, on the part of the Arab chiefs by whom he was deputed, a threatened attack on them, in which that sovereign aimed at their extermination, because, as he informed their ambassador, his astrologers had told him that there would arise among them a person who would overthrow the Persian monarchy. Malik is said to have calmed the wrath of Sapor by suggesting, in the first instance, that astrologers were a class given to lying; and, secondly, that it would be an act of prudence to take milder measures with regard to a race destined to rule over his people.¹

Instances of its use as a proper name occur frequently, and in the form of Abd el Malik, it was borne by one of the Khalifs of the race of Ommiah. I do not find any instance of its being employed as a title of dignity during the first centuries of Muhammadanism, but it came into use as such under the rulers of Egypt. It was conferred on dependent princes, governors, and persons holding high commands. We have *Malik il Misr*, Malik of Egypt, and the title of *Amir il Omra* converted into *Malik il Omra*.

Abulfeda, describing the events of the year 564 of the Hejra, which was the turning-point of the fortunes of Saladin, says that on his (Saladin's) brother's advance into Egypt, the Franks evacuated it, and they received messages of welcome from the reigning Khalif. Saladin and some other officers of the army seized Shavir, the Vizier, who was then put to death by direction of the Khalif of the Fatimite dynasty reigning in Cairo. Whereupon Shircoh, Saladin's brother, was directed to repair to Cairo to receive his investiture, nominally as Vizier, but substantially as ruler of Egypt. The letter patent, which is given in full, is addressed by the servant of God, Commander of the Faithful, to the illustrious Lord (Syud), the victorious Prince (Malik), the Sultan of the armies, friend of the Imams, protector of

¹ D'Herbelot.

the people.”¹ The title appears here merely as one of honour, but it was borne by all ruling princes in Egypt and Syria. Saladin, though in history he appears as the Sultan, *par excellence*, adds this to his other titles, and the same practice was followed by ruling princes of his family, and also by inferior princes, as the Atabegs of Mosul, the Ayubites of Damascus, Aleppo, and Emesa. In all these cases the title is accompanied by an epithet to which some significance is attached. *Il Malik il Mansur*, the victorious prince; *il Malik il Rahim*, the merciful prince; *il Malik es Saleh*, the excellent prince. At the same time it was applied to reigning princes of great states; as the King of England, in Arabian writers of the Crusades, is *Malik il Angtar*,² the French King is *Malik il Faranj*.³

In the bilingual inscriptions of the Norman Kings of Sicily *Malik* is used as the equivalent of *Rex*. We have *Il Malik il Rajar*, or *Il Malik il Tankrid*. In a well-known incident at the close of the Norman dominion, the title *Sultan* is employed in a sarcastic spirit, as if it was especially offensive. The Arabs, or Saracens, as they are called, formed a large portion of the population, and were treated with great consideration by the Norman kings. This became a reproach to them, during the Crusades, and gave some colour to that which Pope Urban IV. preached against Manfred, the last of his race. How much the Norman rulers relied on this portion of their subjects appears from the colonization of Apulia, under the policy of Manfred's father, Frederick II. Before the Holy War was directed against Manfred, Pope Alexander IV. offered to recognize him if he would restore the estates of certain Barons, and expel the Saracens. Manfred acceded to the first of these demands, but resolutely refused the second, relying more on the fidelity of his Saracens than on the Christian Barons, of

الى السيد الاجل الملك المنصور سلطان الجيوش ولي الاسمة
محمير الامة

ملك الانكتار²

ملك الفرج³

whose fickleness he had had experience. Charles d'Anjou was accordingly called in, and the crusade was begun. When Manfred sent deputies to propose terms, "return to your master, the *Sultan* of Nocera," was the reply, "and tell him that I shall either send him to hell, or he shall send me to paradise." Readers of Dante will remember the lines where the poet encounters the hero in a region which was neither heaven nor hell, and is charged to carry to Manfred's daughter the consoling message that the goodness of heaven has arms ready to receive all who turn to him.

The same title also appears on the bilingual coins of the Kings and Queens of Georgia of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. The use of the Arabic language is supposed to betoken a recognition of the superiority of the Seljuk and Orto-kite princes. I do not think any such inference is to be drawn from their borrowing the language or expressions of other nations; similar devices have been frequently resorted to by powerful sovereigns, with a view to aid the circulation of the coinage. Indeed the terms employed involve a claim of independence. I take the first specimen in the examples given by Marsden: "King of Kings (*Malik il Malúk*), Giúrgi ben Dímitri, sword of the Messiah." The second, that of the Queen Támár, is also a specimen of the application of Muhammadan formularies to Christianity: "Queen of Queens, glory of the world and of religion, Támár, daughter of Giúrgi, protector of (the religion of) the Messiah."¹

On the rise of the Mogul power in the thirteenth century, the title I have now under review seems to have fallen into disuse as a royal designation. The Tatar chiefs brought with them from the north that of Khan or Khacan, and this has been constantly employed both by Turks and Moguls ever since. The title Sultan maintained its ground, but not Malik. Quatremère, in the Appendix to the second volume of his translation of Makrizi's History of the Mamluk Sovereigns of Egypt, gives a full extract from a work descriptive of the forms and styles in use in the Egyptian

¹ ظهير المسيح

chancery, and in this the formulary is given under which they were accustomed to address the Great Khans of the Moguls of Iran, and it is added that they did not add the word ملكية, royal, because that title was in no repute with the Moguls.¹

Hulaku, the grandson of Jengiz Khan, and the first Mogul King of Persia, did indeed use the title of Malik on his coins, in the strange form of *Malik il-Malik*, which Marsden renders rex regnorum. But it does not appear on the coins of his descendants. The only formulary in which any word derived from this root is used in the sense of royalty is in the ever-recurring expression, common to all dynasties: "May God preserve his kingdom" (*Malkat* or *Mülk*).

In the pages of Ferishta we find the title constantly recurring, but not as applied to the head of the state. Many of the leading nobles during the Patan rule had it prefixed to their names, and Briggs, in a note to a passage referring to a list of names of the associates of Jelal ud-din, each of whom is distinguished by this prefix, seems to think that their partiality to its use had something to do with their claims to a Jewish origin.² There is no occasion, however, to resort to so forced a supposition to account for the continued use of a title, once held in high esteem, but which, under a course of degradation common to other Eastern designations, had sunk to a lower level. Ibn Batuta³ makes a remark as to the use of the title in India when he visited it in the fourteenth century, which I quote from Price's translation. After mentioning that the Emperor (*i.e.* the Sultan) sent his Vizier with a number of kings, doctors, and grandees to receive the travellers, he adds: "An Emir is with them termed King." The term King is obviously Malik.⁴

¹ The full address runs as follows:

المحضرة الشريفة العالية السلطانية الاعظمية الشاهنشاهية الالواحدية
القانية القلانية "Sa Majesté noble, élevée, le Sultan auguste, le roi des rois,
unique, frère, le Kan un tel."

² Briggs's Ferishta, vol. i. p. 291.

³ Price's translation, p. 110.

⁴ Mr. N. B. E. Baillie has directed my attention to a passage in Elliot's Historians bearing on this point (vol. iii. p. 576), which runs thus: "As regards the great officers of state, those of the highest rank are called Khans, then the Maliks, then the Amirs, etc."

It will not interest the reader to trace the decline of this title any further.

In our own times we find words derived from this root still in use, both in India and in Turkey, connected with property in land. It is to be observed that the root, *Milk*, is given in our dictionaries with the meaning of possession. I am unable to say whether it was employed in that sense in old law treatises. In the *Futtawa Alemgiri*, translated by Mr. N. B. E. Baillie, we find *Malik* used as proprietor, and *Málik*, the present participle, is in Wilson's Glossary of Indian Terms rendered master or proprietor, and applied to persons in Bengal and the North-West Provinces having hereditary rights in the land, and specially applicable to the head man of the village, who is also designated *Málik-mukaddam* or *Málik-zamindar*. *Malikana* is the special due of the same owners when they are not in the actual possession of the land.

In Turkey *Malikana* is applied to Crown grants of land, and *Múlk* to freehold property.

Before parting from this part of my subject, I should not omit to notice a singular use of this title by the Yezidis, or worshippers of the Devil, mentioned by Mr. Layard.¹ The word *Sheitan*, or any word which resembles it in sound, never passes their lips. "When they speak of the Devil," says Mr. Layard, "they do so with reverence as *Melek Taous*, King Peacock, or *Melek el Kout*, the mighty Angel. Sheikh Nasr distinctly admitted that they possessed a bronze figure or copper figure of a bird, which, however, he was careful in explaining was only looked upon as a symbol, and not as an idol." In a subsequent visit to these sectaries Mr. Layard was permitted by one of the Cawals or priests to see this idol, which was enshrined in an inner room and approached with the utmost reverence. We are favoured with a drawing of this representation of the fallen archangel.²

¹ Layard's *Nineveh*, vol. i. p. 298.

² Layard's *Nineveh and Babylon*, p. 48.

SULTAN.

I come now to a title which is more directly associated with imperial rule, in the European sense of the word, than any of the preceding. Its antiquity is indisputable, though not employed in the sense of sovereign ruler. Selden¹ points out that the title *Siltonim* is applied in the Book of Daniel to the lords of the Assyrian monarchy, and is traceable to the same root as Sultan, *Salat*, which signifies to rule, both in Hebrew and Arabic.

With the exception of the instances given above, the traces of the ancient use of the title are very obscure. Manetho, quoted by Josephus, gives *Salatis* as the name of the first of the *Hyksos* or Shepherd Kings of Egypt, a name which has been supposed to be derived from the same root. In one of the Khorsabad inscriptions, translated by Oppert and Menant,² the title appears in the following passage: "Hanon roi de Gaza et Lebech *Sultan* d'Egypte se reunirent à Rapih pour y livrer combat et bataille." The title is also said to have been applied to the Governor of Babylon while it was subject to Assyria, and used in the sense of royal or Babylonian weights.

Equally obscure are the traces of its use in modern times, and before the tenth century A.D., at which period it is said to have started into life, and became associated with the renown of a great conqueror. D'Herbelot, following this tradition, says it was first applied to Mahmud in the way of compliment, and pleased him so much that he bore the title ever afterwards,³ and Gibbon, accepting this statement, says it

¹ Titles of Honour. *Vide* Daniel, vi. 3. The word is rendered in the Authorized Version, rulers (of the provinces), and in the Septuagint ἀρχόντας.

² Journal Asiatique, 1863, p. 9.

³ The story, as told by d'Herbelot, is that Khalaf, ruler of Seistan, a prince who rose into importance in the troubles of the times, being attacked by Mahmud, made his submission and brought the keys of the place, recognizing Mahmud as his *Sultan*. Under the article Sultan in the same Dictionary, Khalaf is described as the Ambassador of the Khalif. The former account is also given by Sir J. Malcolm, in his History of Persia, from the *Zeenut al Towarikh*. Another apocryphal story is given by D'Herbelot with regard to the title of *Waly*, also said to have been conferred by the reigning Khalif, the improbability of which is pointed out by Mr. Thomas in his Essay on the Coins of Ghazni. Ferishta and other writers mention the congratulatory messages of the Khalif, but the titles con-

was expressly invented for Mahmud. There is, however, reason to suppose that it was used in Muhammadan times before the accession of Mahmud. Weil, in his History of the Khalifs, tells us that it is traceable to the times of the Khalif Motawakkel, and that it was applied to one of the commanders of his forces, who is described as the Sultan of a province.¹ This was in the ninth century of our era. In the *Kitab-i-Yamini*, containing the lives of Sabaktagin and his son, said to be derived from contemporary sources, Sabaktagin is described simply as the Amir, while Mahmud is uniformly spoken of as the Sultan; but the title is not confined to him, for one of the Samani rulers of Bokhara received, on his accession, the oaths of his troops as their general and Sultan. From these instances, and from the use in later times of the title of Sultan of armies, I infer that it was applied to high military commands, something in the way that the title Emperor was used in Rome.

However this may be, the title acquired importance when associated with the renown of the Sultan Mahmud, as his name appears in history. It was borne by his successors, and was the special title by which the Patan sovereigns of Dehli were distinguished, and it seems to have been particularly affected by Turkish dynasties in western Asia. We have seen that Malik Shah received the investiture of the title and power of Sultan at the hands of the reigning

ferred were religious titles in ordinary usage. Amidst this confusion, the only point on which one can rest with confidence is that the title is especially connected with the Ghazvide dynasty, and that uniform tradition applies it to Mahmud as the first to employ it as a royal title. Mr. Thomas does, indeed, point out, in his Essay on the Coins of the Kings of Ghazni, that the title does not appear on the coins of Mahmud, nor of his immediate successors, and he infers from this that, although this great conqueror may have been addressed by this form, he did not employ it in his official acts. The evidence of these coins is not, however, conclusive on such a point, for they are so overlaid with Muhammadan symbols and texts from the Koran, that there is little room left for more than the bare name of the sovereign. When anything is added, it is generally one or more of those titles, like "right hand of the state," which mark his allegiance to the Khalif.

¹ Geschichte der Caliphen, vol. ii. p. 345, note. "Von einem Sultanstitel sheint aber auch Freitag an seinem Quellen nach gefunden zu haben. Erst unter Mutawakkel kommt der Sultanstitel bei Halebi vor, da heisst es (p. 24) Afsharbamian war einer der Feldherren Mutawakkels und seiner vertrauter. Mutawakkel ernannte ihn entweder zum oberhaupte den truppen von Kinestrin ober er war der Sultan zur zeit Mutawakkels so dass er die unterstatthalter entsetzen konnte."

Khalif. An equally powerful prince of the race of Othman, Bayazid, is said to have sent a brilliant embassy to Egypt to receive from the Khalif his benediction and investiture. Both of these great dynasties have been specially known in history with this title, which was also borne by Saladin and his successors, and by the Mamluk sovereigns in Egypt. It was not, however, confined to the ruling sovereigns of these dynasties. Abulfeda, who was descended from a brother of Saladin, received the *Sultanat* of Hamath from the reigning sovereign in Egypt. This appears distinctly in the notice of his life in the biographical dictionary of Aboul-Mahassan, quoted by Reinaud in his preface to the *Geography of Abulfeda*. The heading of a letter addressed to this prince gives him various titles, including that of Sultan, which are identical with those applied to the Sultan of Egypt.¹ The address was simply to the Prince of Hamath, that is, to the *Sahib*, a title in constant use in the early centuries of the Hejra, and in the history of Abulfeda. It is usually applied to the governors of places. It is evidently the counterpart of the *Dominus* or *δεσπότης* of the empire.

Another specimen of the style in use is given by Abulfeda himself in his narrative of the accession of his cousin to the same principality. In the letter addressed to his uncle during his illness by the Sultan, the titles correspond very nearly to those quoted above, but the heading is curious—"on the part of the *Mamluk* Kalaun." It is said by Quatremère that it was the practice of the Mamluk princes of both dynasties to make use of this title, expressive of their servile origin. In the passage of Makrizi's history which gives rise to this remark, the Sultan Bibars exchanges presents with the ruler of Yemen, and is described as tracing with his own hand the heading of the letter, "the *Mamluk*" (*Histoire des Sultans Mamlouks*, part ii., p. 49, note). Some examples of the same style are given by Quatremère in the second volume of the same work, p. 5, note.

وبالتمام السريف العالي المولى السلطاني العمادي الملك المويدي¹
.رضي العموان صاحباً حماتاً

In the work on the forms of the Egyptian Chancery, referred to on a preceding page, an illustration is given of the care that was taken in the use of this servile designation. It should be observed that it was commonly employed in letters addressed to those of inferior rank. In other cases difficulties arose. In the instance given the sovereign was the Khan of Kabjak, and his titles are recited in full. This is the author's comment, which I quote from Quatremère's translation:—
 “Lorsque la paix eut été conclue entre le Sultan Naser Mohammed ben Kelaoun, et le Khan Abou Said, le Kadi Ala Eddin Ebn Alathir réfléchit durant un mois sur la forme que l'on devait adopter pour la correspondance. Il dit au Sultan. Si, en écrivant au prince nous employons la formule, *son frère* أخوه, peut-être la chose ne lui conviendra pas. Si nous mettons le Mamlouk, et que nous ne disions pas, il est le Mamlouk, ce serait une honte pour nous, et nous ne pourrions plus changer la mode de la correspondance.”

There is an exception to the general use by Turkish conquerors of the title Sultan about the same epoch, in the case of the Turkoman Ortokites, who reigned in Syria, and who usually styled themselves Maliks of Diarbekr, a very rare instance of a territorial title appearing on coins; sometimes Malik is employed with one of the usual epithets, *il nasir* or *es-saleh*. The Atabegs of Syria, powerful chiefs, who rose to power when that of the Seljuk rulers declined, seem not to have ventured on the title of Sultan.

The Mogul conquerors of Asia did not affect the title during the beginning of their career. They brought with them that of Khan or Khacan from the North, and used it on their coins. Thus that of Hulaku, grandson of Jengiz Khan, the first Mogul King of Persia, runs: “King of Kings, the greatest Kaan, Hulaku, the illustrious Khan.”¹ The title of Sultan came, however, soon into use among the descendants of Jengiz, and is found on coins of their dynasty

¹ ملك الملك قان الاعظم هولاقو ايلخان المعظم. The term قان الاعظم is supposed by Marsden to be intended for Hulaku's father, Mangu Khan, whose supremacy was thus acknowledged.

and of that branch of the family who founded a kingdom on the northern shores of the Caspian, and are known by the designation of the Khans of Kapchak.

In Persia it was rarely used after the accession of the Sufi dynasty in the sixteenth century. The only instances of its appearance on their coins that have come under my notice are in the case of Hussein, who reigned at the close of the seventeenth century, and of the famous Nadir Shah, whose title on his coins runs, "Nadir, lord of the (planetary) conjunctions, is Sultan of the Sultans of the world, Shah of Shahs."¹

Long ere this, the title had been applied to sovereigns of every rank and degree, without the title itself being connected with anything which we connect with imperial rule. The mode of using the title varied in different states and with different sovereigns. With the Patan monarchs in India it was usually accompanied by an epithet, the great, or the just. Eighteen of these sovereigns bear on their coins descriptions of this nature; seven have the curious combination of Shah Sultan; two are described as Sultan of Sultans. Saladin, we have seen, bore the title of Sultan of the Faith, and another Egyptian ruler received the title of Sultan of the armies (of the Khalif). The house of Othman, though it had its weaknesses, did not deal in these high-sounding epithets. In their early coinage we have merely Orkhan, son of Othman, or Bayazid, son of Murad; but afterwards, when Sultan was joined to the names, the titles were Sultan Bayazid (the second), the son of Muhammad, or Sultan Suleiman, son of Selim. We have none of those affected titles, implying zeal for the faith, which were introduced by the Khalifs. The sovereigns reign with the name which they received in their infancy.² On the other hand, they exhibited as much ostentatious display of titles in their public acts as

¹ هست سلطان بر سلاطین جهان شاه شاهان نادر صاحب قران

² In the letter from Achmet to Henry IV. of France, before referred to, the sovereign is described as Achmet filz de l'Empereur Mahomet, de l'Empereur Amorat, etc. Through the whole pedigree l'Empereur may be assumed to be Sultan in the original.

any of their predecessors, either in Europe or Asia. D'Ohsson¹ enumerates the following titles as used by these sovereigns: Shah, Padishah, Shahinshah, Khan, Khacan, Khundkear, and Khaudawendikear, in imitation, as he remarks, of ancient kings in the East. This mixture of titles belongs to the East, but the Othman rulers also copied the style of the Greek Emperors of Constantinople, in the use of the expression lord of the two continents and of the two seas,² and they exceeded the extravagance of feudal rulers in the West in setting out their territorial possessions.

A specimen of this style is given by Selden as it was employed in the seventeenth century. The letter of Ahmet addressed to Henry IV. of France describes the Sultan as ruler of Europe, Asia, and Africa, conquered by his victorious sword and lance. This is qualified by the recital, "ascavoir de pays et royaumes de la Grece, de Themisuar, de Bossena, de Seguituar, des pays et des royaumes de l'Asie, de la Natolie, de la Caramanie," etc., etc. I spare the reader the full recital. It was not usual to set forth these detailed claims in treaties. In one instance I find the Sultan described as the Emperor of Asia and of Greece,³ but it is more common to describe him simply as the Emperor or Padshah of the Ottomans, or the Sublime Porte.

In the heading of a treaty between the Ottoman Porte and the Government of Venice, in the year 1595, given in a recent number of the *Journal Asiatique*, he is fancifully described as the Sultan of the Sultans of the world, the first of the Khacans of the age, and the distributor of the Crown of the Khosrous of the world.⁴

It is in letters patent and in capitulations that the territorial claims appear in their utmost licence. For a specimen

¹ *Tableau général de l'Empire Ottoman.*

² سلطان البرين و خاقان البحرین.

³ The treaty of peace between Charles VI. of Germany and Achmed Khan, 1718.

⁴ سلاطين جهان و برهان خواقين دوران تاج بخش حسموان
روي زمين سلطان.

of this style, I refer the reader to one which is given in the *Supplement au Corps Diplomatique*, vol. v. p. 727, where the dominions subject to the Ottoman rule are described with extreme minuteness, extending over provinces, cities and islands, both in Asia and Europe.

I must, however, give insertion to the following specimen of Turkish grandiloquence, which I have selected because it enables me to add the proper designations from the original. It is taken from Meninski's *Lexicon*, under the title *Padshah*: "Magnorum mundi principum regumque supremi, ac illustrium seculi monarcharum maximi, maris utriusque ac terræ domini, (*Sultan*), orientis ac occidentis utriusque monarchæ (*Khacan*), ambarum basilicarum civitatumque sanctarum (*Meccæ et Medinæ*) servi, oculi hominum et pupillæ oculorum, assertoris securitatis et tranquillitatis mortalium, auctoris quietis humanorum cordium, gratia regis invocati Dei triumphatoris, et ope gloriosi et benefici Dei fulti victoris, magnificentissimi, terribilissimi, potentissimi monarchæ (*Padshah*), nostri Sultan Abdulrehmed Cham, cujus imperii (*Khilafateh*) continuata series nunquam deficeat, imo extendetur usque ad finem seculi, felix et fulgida porta."

I return to the history of this title in the East. The extent to which it was in use in the fourteenth century is well illustrated in the travels of Ibn Batuta. At this time Central and Western Asia were divided among a variety of principalities, to the rulers of which the title of Sultan is almost uniformly applied. The irruptions of the Moguls in the previous century had shattered the power of the Turks, but had laid the foundation of no strong government, except in China. The Othman family was rising into importance, but the condition of these countries was such that every governor of a province assumed the title of Sultan. In Asia Minor only, this traveller names no less than ten princes bearing that designation and described as the Sultans of different places. In the following passage the term is used as the equivalent of ruler. He is speaking of the Khan of Kipchak: "This Sultan, Mahomed Uzbek, is one of the seven great kings of the world; which are the

Sultan of the West, the Sultan of Egypt and Syria, the Sultan of the two Iraks, the Sultan of the Turks Uzbek, the Sultan of Turkistan and Marwara el Nahar, the Sultan of India, and the Sultan of China." This indiscriminate use of the term on the part of a traveller is, of course, only to be taken as a proof of the sense in which it was popularly employed; but the usage is confirmed by the inscriptions on the coins of this period, whether of Turkish or Mogul rulers.

D'Herbelot says that Timur did not assume the title of Sultan until late in his career, that title having been hitherto reserved to the family of Jengiz Khan. This remark may be assumed to apply to the branch of the family which reigned in Turkistan. Coins are extant¹ with the names of Muhammad Khan, the last member of this branch, and that of Timur conjoined. In the specimens of the coins of Timur and his descendants, which are given by Fraehn, the name of Sultan Muhammad Khan is joined not merely with that of Timur, but of his son. In those coins of Timur, in which his name appears alone, the legend runs simply, Amir Timur Gurgan. In the work on the forms in usage in the Egyptian court, referred to by Quatremère in the appendix to his translation of Makrizi's history, mention is made of a letter addressed by Timur to Malik Dhaher Barkok; the signature of the great conqueror runs simply Timur Kurkan. The reply was in the form usually applied to the Amirs of those countries, and it is said that Timur took great offence at the omission of the title Khan. The title Sultan was evidently in no great repute, though it is applied to him with other designations in the Khutbeh, already quoted, and appears on the coins of his descendants.

This, indeed, appears more conclusively in the memoirs of his descendant, the founder of the so-called Mogul dynasty in India. In the time of Baber this title was still borne by the Patan sovereigns of Dehli, and by the Muhammadan rulers in the South. The adversary whose power Baber overthrew at the Battle of Paniput is described by him

¹ Marsden, vol. i. p. 277. The inscription runs, "Sultan Muhammad Khan Amir Timur Gurgan."

as Sultan Ibrahim, and he speaks of the Muhammadan rulers in Southern India as the Sultans of the Deccan; but the title had then become so common that in a great engagement between the Uzbegs and Turkomans in Central Asia, no less than nine Sultans are said to have fallen in one of the armies; and a considerable number of the officers in command of divisions in Baber's Indian armies bear this prefix. We read of Sultans as well as Khans of the Uzbegs, but in Baber's own family the manner in which the title was applied leaves some doubt whether it was an honorary title or proper name. His own father, who reigned at Ferghana, is simply Omer Sheik Mirza, and one of his uncles, who reigned at Cabul, is described as Ulugh Beg Mirza; but three of his uncles on his father's side and one on his mother's have the prefix of Sultan. It was also applied to some ladies of his family. How little importance was attached in his own mind to the title is clear from his remark, when he assumed that of Padshah: "Till this time," he says, "the family of Timur Beg, even although on the throne, had never assumed any other title than that of Mirza.¹ At this period I ordered that they should style me Padshah."

With the rise of the new dynasty the title declined, and almost passed away in Eastern Asia. It appears on some of the coins of Baber and also of Akbar, but the usual title of this dynasty was that of Padshah, or Padshah Ghazi, (victorious for the faith), a title which was uniformly borne by Baber's successors, even by Shah Alum at the lowest point of the fortunes of the family.

Though assumed by Nadir Shah in the form of Sultan of Sultans, it has long since ceased to be the title of any such sovereign, except that of Constantinople. Tipu Sahib took the title of Sultan on his accession, and we hear of petty Muhammadan chiefs in the Indian Archipelago and elsewhere, such as the Sultans of Perak and of Zanzibar, who still bear the title. Were it not for its being connected with the Ottoman dynasty, one might say that it, like the others

¹ Abbreviation of Amirzadeh.

I have mentioned, has run its course ; but, even in Turkey, one of the titles with which I have still to deal bears a higher significance than this ancient title of the family.

Before quitting this subject I may add a remark on its application to females. Sultan originally admitted of both genders. Reziah, daughter of Altamsh, reigned at Dehli in the thirteenth century as Sultan. The title on her coins runs : "The great Sultan Reziah, of the world and of religion."¹ In Baber's time it was applied to several ladies of his family. Two of his sisters bore respectively the names of Yadgar Sultan Begum and Rokhia Sultan Begum, and the name of the mother of the former, who was a concubine, was Agha Sultan. The conversion of the word into a female title, Sultana, is of Western origin, and seems to have taken its rise with the Greeks. Ducange, at the word *Σουλτάνα*, shows that it was introduced into the language of the Church. Cyril Lascaris, Patriarch of Constantinople, applies the term to the mother of our Lord, in the sense in which the words Our Lady are employed in the West. The quotation runs : "*Τὴν μεγάλην βασιλίссαν τὴν μεγάλην Σουλτάναν τὴν παναγίαν μας, τὴν κυρίαν μας, τὴν ἰδίαν τοῦ (χριστοῦ) μητέρα.*" This kind of barbarism was not confined to this particular title. Selden gives an example of the creation of the word Shahana for Queen, and applied to the wife of Yakub Beg by Murád II.

KHALIF.

This title, which was once connected with a wide empire, may be almost said to be obsolete; for, although it is assumed by the Sultans of Constantinople, who use the title of universal Khalif, and claim to inherit the authority of the ancient Khalifs of Baghdad, the religious title is merged in their territorial authority, and carries very little weight beyond the immediate subjects of these princes.

Some of the sovereigns of this dynasty appear to have used it frequently. Leunclavius, quoted by Selden,² says that he

¹ السلطان الأعظم رضيه الدنيا والدين.

² Titles of Honour.

had seen it in the letters of Murád III. to the Emperor Rudolph II. Selden adds that it appears in letters patent of Suliman and Selim II., the word in the original being *chaliph olem*, "Khalif of the World." On the other hand, it does not appear in the letter addressed by Achmet to Henry IV. of France, of which a French translation is given by Selden in the same work. In the examples of Turkish titles quoted above from Meninski's Lexicon, it is not applied to the sovereign, but his empire is the Khalifat. The title, universal Khalif, which I have quoted above, is from D'Ohsson, vol. vi. p. 162; but this author, after giving a long list of the terms in use, adds that there is no invariable form, much being left to the discretion [and bad taste] of the Secretary of the Chancery.¹

The only other instance of the assumption of this title by any great sovereign which I have fallen in with is in the case of Akber, among specimens of his coinage given in the *Ayeen Akbery*. The inscription on one runs, "The Sultan of Sultans, the most exalted Khalif," while another is said to be struck at the Khalifat of Agra. It will be seen in my remarks on the title following this, that the Khalifs were more generally spoken of as Commanders of the Faithful, or Imams, this being, perhaps, the reason that the historical title appears so rarely on coins or public documents.

This title was originally assumed to denote the spiritual

¹ I may here add a curious passage, given by Selden to show that, in the very infancy of the rule of the Ottoman dynasty, the title of Khalif was affected by them. Orkhan, the son of the first Othman, addressed letters to the states of the Saracens in Africa and Spain, urging them to attack the Christians in Spain. This was translated by a Saracen captive into Latin, and thence into Spanish, and afterwards into French, and was sent with other letters of intelligence to Edward III. of England. "De moy Goldifa, vn ley Exerif, Savdan, seignior sages, fort et puissant seignior de la mesen de Mck du seint hautesse, et en la sue saint vertu fesant justices hauts et basses, constreignant sur toux constreignants, seignior du railm di Turky et de Pereye, retenour des terres de Hermenye, seignior de la dobbles et de les dobbles de la mere merveilleuse, perceinor de les febles ore anutz en la saint ley Mahomet, seignior de la fort espee de Elias et de David que tua.—My book instructs me no further, but is here torn. Goldifa is Calipha."

I should suppose that the expression "la dobbles et les dobbles de la mere merveilleuse" has reference to the claim of lordship over the two seas and of the two continents.

It has been pointed out to me that the Euxine received the title of wonderful from Herodotus. Darius sitting in the temple of Jupiter, while preparing for the passage of the Bosphorus, casts his eyes over the Euxine, to which the historian adds: *Εὐντα ἀξιοθέτητον, πελαγῶν γάρ ἀπάντων πέφυκε θαυμασιώτατος.* iv. 85.

nature of the new government. It is said that Abubekr, the immediate successor of Muhammad, would take no other title than *Khalifah*¹ *resul allah*, the Vicegerent of the sent of God; and it was applied to all his successors until the final extinction of the Khalifat of Baghdad in the thirteenth century A.D. This empire received its first shock in the second century of the Hejra; the unwieldy empire rapidly fell to pieces, and the dignity was assumed by a member of the family of Ommiah, who founded a Khalifat dynasty in Spain, and, after the fall of Baghdad, one of the family of the last Khalif escaped to Egypt, and was recognized as Khalif, but without any temporal authority. A great prestige attached to this dignity, long after the Khalifs themselves ceased to lead the armies of the Faithful, and, in the lowest ebb of their power, they conferred titles and dignities, and disposed of provinces with the same confident assurance as the Popes of Rome.

The ecclesiastical character of their rule is recognized by contemporary European writers. The term Khalif is frequently rendered Papa or Pope, and, in a passage of Joinville, quoted by Selden, the Khalif of Baghdad is described as "l'Apostle des Sarazins," the term apostle being frequently applied to the Pope. Matthew of Paris writes, "In terrâ de Baldach habitat papa Saracenorum, qui Caliphus appellatur et tenetur in lege eorum et adoratur sicut Pontifex maximus apud nos."

In the palmy days of their power their court was one of great magnificence, and, even in its decline, the person of the Khalif was treated with the greatest respect, by the rude soldiers that stripped them of power. The Seljuk Sultans held their stirrups, and conducted them on foot to the mosque, unless invited by the pontiff to mount; while a strip of black velvet was suspended from one of the windows of the palace, which was called the sleeve of the Khalif, and all the officers of state were expected to kiss it daily, and prostrate themselves on the threshold of the palace gate.²

¹ Selden points out that the word Khalif appears in its literal sense as *vice* or *ἀντί* in the Syriac version of the Scriptures, where, in St. Matthew, Archelaus is said to reign instead of or in place of Herod. The Syriac has *Cheulaph Herodes*.

² D'Herbelot.

In Egypt they were little more than puppets in the hands of the Mamluk princes, though their authority was always appealed to, on accessions or usurpations, and their court was surrounded with a certain amount of pomp and dignity. A very graphic account is given, in Makrizi's history, of the reception of the first of this line of Khalifs, by Daher Bibars, then ruler at Cairo. Intelligence reached him that the son of the Abbasside Khalif, Daher Abu Nasr Muhammad, was on his way to Damascus, under the escort of a body of Arabs. He was said to have escaped from Baghdad when it fell into the hands of the Moguls, and, having passed several years in obscurity among the Arabs of Irak, was now about to throw himself on the protection of Bibars. The Mamluk prince gave orders to the governors of all the towns to receive with the highest honour the descendant of the Prophet ; but it became necessary to verify the strange narrative, and the suspicions regarding the validity of the claim were probably heightened by a fact, mentioned by Abulfeda, that this descendant of the Khalifs was *very black*. The Amirs, whom he consulted, assured him that the Arab chiefs who formed the escort were known and trustworthy, and so preparation was made for his reception. The cortège which accompanied him gathered in numbers as he proceeded ; and when he reached Cairo, the whole town turned out to meet him. The Sultan advanced with his whole court, followed by all his forces, the principal inhabitants, and the Muezzins. Jews and Christians are said to have taken a part in the proceedings, bearing with them, the former the Pentateuch, and the latter the Gospels. The Khalif, clothed in the attire of the Abbassides, accompanied by the Sultan, entered Cairo by the gate called Bab annassir (gate of victory), and he was conducted to a palace prepared for him. A Court was afterwards held, when the Sultan sat by his side without any mark of dignity, and a long proceeding ensued for the purpose of verifying the truth of his descent from the old line ; the proceedings were then embodied in a formal document by the Kadi al kadat. Whereupon the Sultan did homage to the Commander of the Faithful, engaging to follow the precepts of the Book of God

and every rule of good government; and his example was followed by the other dignitaries, and the Khalif, in gratitude, delivered to the Sultan an act of investiture, by which he conferred on him, not only the countries subject to Muhammadan rule, but all those that he could, with the aid of God, conquer from the unbelievers.¹

Notwithstanding these outward demonstrations of respect, the Khalifs in Egypt exercised no influence over the politics of the country. Their authority was appealed to, to sanction the military revolutions, of which Egypt was then frequently the scene, but which they did not control. A passage from Peter Martyr, (quoted by Selden), giving an account of the inauguration of a new Sultan, shows how completely the spiritual authority was kept in subjection to the temporal. The passage runs thus: "A summo eorum pontifice Mammetes (the Mamluk prince) confirmatur. Habent nempe et ipsi summum pontificem, ad quem hujus imperii machina, si Ægyptii homines essent, pertineret. Jus suum, ut cæteri consuevere, Mammeti Cairi regiam tenenti, trium millium auri drachmarum pretio pontifex vendidit. Is califfas dicitur. E tribunali, Soldano stanti pedibus, vitæ necisque liberam potestatem præstat. Ipse descendit, se ipsum spoliatur, Soldanum imperaturum induit, abit privatus, permanet in imperio Mammetes."

This title is so immediately connected with that of Commander of the Faithful, that I will proceed at once to the history of this latter appellation, which has been assumed to carry with it an imperial significance.

¹ Makrizi's History, Quatremère's translation, vol. i. p. 146. The Khalif subsequently delivered the Khotbeh at the Great Mosque, and pronounced a very long discourse, in which there was another conveyance of all the countries which the Sultan's arms could conquer. There is much more in detail of the fêtes and honours done to the new Pontiff, extending over many pages. His success encouraged a rival pretender to the dignity. The Khalif, after parting from the Sultan, proceeded under an escort in the direction of Aleppo, and encountered, on his way, this new claimant, who had an escort of 700 Turkoman cavaliers. The Khalif proposed terms, and invited him to act with him to raise the house of Abbas. The "pretender," as he is called, accepted the proposal, and received honourable treatment.

COMMANDER OF THE FAITHFUL.

This title, though not so well known to European historians, has been more widely spread and more durable than that of Khalif. Its origin is thus described by D'Herbelot. Omar, the second Khalif, when elected on the death of Abubekr, represented to the assembled chiefs the difficulty he would experience in styling himself the Vicar of the Vice, and that the difficulty would increase with each successor. Whereupon Mogairah, son of Shaab, addressed Omar thus: "My lord, you are our Amir. We are, by the grace of God, Al-Mumenin, the Faithful; receive the title, if it please you, of Amir al Mumenin." The proposal was well received, and it was ever after borne by those who assumed to be the successors of Muhammad, and it was the only title ever borne by them.

The title Amir, Commander, is commonly rendered imperator, and was borne by the generals of the armies of the faithful, and afterwards by those who ruled provinces under the real or nominal authority of the Khalifs, until it was superseded by that of Sultan. The Amir al Omra, Commander of the Commanders, was the usual designation of the chief minister of the Khalifs, and played an important part in their history, and has also been in use under Turkish and other Muhammadan governments. Like other sovereign titles, that of Amir is still in use, though it has long since ceased to be specially connected with rule or military command.

But the term Amir was, in early Muhammadan times, not confined to commanders of high rank. Makrizi, in his history of the Mamluk Sultans, speaks of the Arabs who came to the aid of one of these rulers against the Tartars, as under their Amirs, as if they were sheiks or chiefs; but in the Turkish armies of this period it was a title of command of a special grade, conferred by the Sultan himself. On one occasion, I observe, mention is made of an Amir of ten. De Joinville rightly understood the purport of the name, where he states: "Quand le Souldan estoit en personne en guerre combatant, celuy des chevaliers de la Haulequa, qui mieux s'esprouvoit et faisoit des faiz d'armes, le Souldan le faisoit

Admiral, ou capitaine, ou bien lui bailloit et donnoit charge de gens d'armes, selon ce qu'il le meritoit; et que plus faisoit, plus lui donnoit le Souldan."

The *Haulqua*, or Halkah, (حلقه), or circle, was the body guard of the prince, which, under some sovereigns, became an army. Saladin is said to have had ten thousand under his direct command. They were purchased slaves, and, by force of circumstances, became a warrior caste, like the Janissaries, and are well known to history as the Mamluks of this period.

But my concern is chiefly with the Amirs of the Faithful. This title was retained by these ecclesiastical rulers long after they ceased to be warriors. It was not until the fifth century of the Hejra that it was borne by any other prince than the Khalif. Malik Shah, the third of the line of the Seljuk dynasty, had it conferred on him by the reigning Khalif, who, according to D'Herbelot, sent a special embassy to confirm him in the title and power of Sultan, adding also this special dignity, hitherto reserved by the Khalifs to themselves. It had, indeed, been already applied to Mahmud of Ghazni, in the inscription on the minaret or pillar raised to his memory, of which I have given the translation in a former page, and on that, near Ghazni, raised to his successor Mas'ud.¹ Within a very few years of the date of the accession of Malik Shah, it was conferred on a prince of the Marabut dynasty in Western Africa, by the Moorish chiefs who had invited him to come to their aid in Spain. This prince, Yusuf ben Tashfin, defeated Alphonso VI. of Leon and Castile in a great battle near Badajoz. An Arabic writer, quoted by Makrizi in his treatise on Musalman coins, says that, after the battle, thirteen kings elected and proclaimed him Amir of the Musalmans, and that he was the first of this race of rulers who bore the title.²

¹ See Thomas on the Coins of the Kings of Ghazni (Journ. R. A. S. Vol. XVII.). Further evidence of the assumption of the title by Mas'ud is given in the same essay, in a quotation by an Arabic writer. The act in which it appears was agreed to by this sovereign A. H. 423.

² Marsden, vol. i. pp. 348-9. Marsden quotes from De Sacy's translation of Makrizi: "Il se trouva près de lui treize rois que l'éluèrent et le proclamèrent Emir des Musulmans. C'est le premier des rois du Magreb que ait porté ce titre." The title borne by the heads of governments in Spain and North Africa at this time was the old Arabic one of *Amir*, and it appears on the coinage of this

After this it came into more frequent use, especially with the rulers of North Africa. Selden gives instances of its use by these rulers, both on coins and letters, and refers to Scaliger, who had seen it in letters addressed by the Emperors (*sic*) of Fez and Morocco to the States of the Low Countries, and he adds that he himself had seen it, in their letters to Elizabeth and James.¹ He also mentions that the Sultans of Constantinople assumed the same title somewhat modified—*Padshah Musulmin*.

It is curious to find it applied to the reigning Khalif on a coin of Jengiz Khan. At no period of the career of this conqueror had he shown any respect for the Muhammadan religion. On the contrary, when he entered Bokhara, he is said to have ascended the reading desk of a mosque and thrown the Koran under the hoofs of his horses. He and his descendants were tolerant as to religious usages, and it is possible that this word may have been introduced into his coinage, from motives of policy, after his conquest of Kharizm and Khorasan. If so, he certainly failed to conciliate the believers. Abulfeda, describing the events of the year 616 of the Hejra (A.D. 1219), says that never did the Moslems undergo such trials from the Franks on the one hand, and from the Tatar irruption under Jengiz Khan, piously adding, "On whom be the curse of God!"²

sovereign, who is styled *Al Amir Yusuf ben Tashfin*. An extract from Abulfeda is given by Marsden, confirming the fact of the assumption of the title of the Khalifs. That on Yusuf's coins appears as *Amir il Mumenin*.

¹ Selden quotes a passage from Matthew of Paris to the effect that John of England sent a secret embassy to one of these potentates, offering to turn Muhammadan. The chronicler styles him "Admiralium Murmelium, quem vulgus miramomelinum vocat." The embassy may be apocryphal, but the chronicler may be quoted in proof of the recognition of the title at this period. The naval title Admiral is distinctly traced to this Arabic original. Selden points out that the monkish historians of the holy wars are full of these Admirabiles, Admiralli, and Ammiralli. De Joinville calls them Admiraulx, and speaks of the Admiraulx d'Egypte or Admiraulx de Babiloyne. So Milton compares Satan's spear to

"The mast

Of some great *Ammiral*."

Amirals or admirals were known to the Genoese in the twelfth century, and the office is mentioned in English history in the century following. The first English admiral was W. de Leybourne, who was appointed by Edward I. under the title *Admiral de la mer du Roi d'Angleterre*.

² The coin to which I refer is given in Mr. Thomas's Essay on the Coins of the Kings of Ghazni, Vol. IX. p. 385. The name which precedes the title is that of the Khalif then reigning at Baghdad—Nasir le din Illah.

The prestige of this great name long survived the decline of the power of the Khalifs. It had been usual in coinage to add the title of the reigning Khalif. Of this there are frequent instances on coins of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. After the fall of Baghdad, the Khalifs in Egypt, though little more than domestic chaplains of the warrior caste that ruled, were courted by distant potentates. The head of the rising Ottoman family applied to Egypt for a confirmation of a new title. Gibbon thus describes the event: "The humble title of Emir was no longer suitable to the Ottoman greatness, and Bajazet condescended to accept a patent of Sultan from the Caliphs who served in Egypt under the yoke of the Mamelukes, a last and frivolous homage, that was yielded by force of opinion, by the Turkish conquerors, to the house of Abbas and the successors of the Arabian prophet."¹

It is less surprising to hear of a weak Patan ruler at Dehli making a similar application to one of these dependent Khalifs. The passage describing it is quoted in full, from *Ferishta*, by Marsden, and it is so curious, as illustrative of the superstitious importance which was attached to the acts of the Khalifs, that I make no apology for inserting it here: "In the year 743 (says the historian) doubts arose in the mind of the Sultan regarding the legality of his title to the sovereignty of India, unsanctioned as it was by the consent of a Khalif of the house of Al-Abbâs. Whilst deliberating on the means by which this defect could be repaired, he obtained information that the rulers of Egypt had been induced, from certain considerations, to raise an individual of the race to the honours of the Khalifat. Having satisfied himself of this, he instantly did homage, in secret, to the exalted personage, whose name he ordered to be placed on the coinage instead of his own. He likewise prohibited throughout the city the public reading of the customary prayers on the weekly days of assembly and the festivals, and having employed two or three months in preparing a suitable address to the Khalif, at length despatched it to Egypt. In

¹ Cap. 64.

744 the messenger returned, and along with him came the Sa'id Sarsari, who was the bearer of a diploma from the Khalif, investing the Sultan with full possession of the government, together with a royal dress. On this occasion he advanced ten or twelve miles to meet the Sa'id (descendant of the Prophet), attended by the whole body of the nobles and men of the learned professions. After kissing the feet of the holy man, he placed the diploma of the Khalif on his own head, and marched with it several paces on foot. In honour of it he caused commemorative buildings to be erected in the city, and scattered money amongst the people. He directed that the public prayers, which had for a time been suspended, should be resumed on the appointed days, and the name of the Khalif should be pronounced in the Khutbeh; excluding therefrom the names of all the former Sultans of Dehli, even that of his own father, who had not reigned with the necessary sanction. On the embroidered borders of his robes and on the friezes of his buildings the Khalif's name was displayed. With his own hand he wrote an address, containing numberless expressions of humility and submissive homage, and having selected from the jewels of his treasury a precious gem of incomparable beauty, he gave it, together with the writing, in charge to the messenger, in order to their being delivered to the Khalif, in Egypt."

It is not surprising to see the head of an effete dynasty, that was soon to give way before the conquering arms of Timur and his descendants, seek for a religious sanction to his rule. It is more significant of the importance attached to the ancient headship of the empire that Timur himself was glad to avail himself of any link that connected him with the government established by the Prophet.

In the fifth book of the narrative which bears the name of his Memoirs, the events are described connected with his accession to the headship of the state. There were other claimants, and the question was referred to an assembly convened by Syud Abu'l Berkat (the father of blessings). It was proposed that a prince, descended from the great

Jengiz, should be placed on the throne, and Timur should be his deputy; but Abu'l Berkat appealed to those present, both as Turks and as Musalmans, to recognize the services already rendered by Timur, and added, that after the fall of the Khalifs, the inheritance of Muhammad and his claim of sovereignty fell to the descendants of the Prophet, of whom he was one, and so, in conjunction with the other Syuds, he pronounced the Amir Timur deputy of the Khalifs, and appointed him ruler over all the Musalmans in Turan. One of Timur's rivals insisted on the question being decided by lot; but the lot fell on Timur, "and they were all ashamed," so proceeds the narrative.

In the inauguration of the new rule, which followed, the Syuds took the lead, and when, on the Aid of Ramzan, Timur went to the mosque, he was invited to commence the service. Timur hesitated to take the part of Imam; but one and all declared him to be the successor of the Khalifs, patron of their religion, guardian of the Holy Land, and protector of the servants of God.¹

This superstitious respect for the authority of the Khalifs continued to appear on coins of Indian sovereigns, both in Dehli and in Bengal.² Sometimes it went no further than to say that the coin was struck in the name of the Commander of the Faithful, with a prayer for the perpetuity of the Khalifat, omitting the name. But when all doubts were removed as to the extinction of the Khalifat, it came to be the practice to introduce the names of the immediate successors of the Prophet. In one instance, a coin of Shir Shah, a soldier of fortune, who drove Humayun from Hindustan and reigned for a time in Dehli, is said to have been struck by the authority (*i.e.* under the auspices) of

¹ Memoirs of Timur, translated by Major Stewart, pp. 135, 6.

² An exception to this general remark will be found in some of the coins of Kutb-ud din Mubarik Shah, who reigned in Dehli A.H. 716-720. This young man was a wretched voluptuary, and during his short reign exhibited no abilities or vigour. Ferishta offers an apology for recording his excesses. This special coinage was, probably, the result of some drunken freak. The prince is described on some of them as "the Supreme Imam, Khalifah of the God of heaven and earth." Thomas, Chronicles of the Pathan Kings of Dehli, pp. 179-182.

the Commander of the Faithful, *Ledin illah*, one of the Abbasside Khalifs of Baghdad, who died three centuries before this time.¹ But at this period the introduction of the names of the successors of Muhammad is to be understood merely as an expression of orthodoxy, *i.e.* the profession of the Sunnite faith of the reigning prince. A common formulary is to introduce their attributes, "By the truth of Abubekr and the justice of Omar, by the modesty of Othman and the knowledge of Aly."² The coins of the Mogul sovereigns of Hindustan are frequently said to be struck at the seat of the Khalifat—Agra or Shahjehanabad. In these later times, the title of Commander of the Faithful seems to have dropped out of use. Nothing probably contributed so powerfully to this as the great schism of the Muhammadans. While the Indian rulers paraded the symbols of the Sunnites, the Persian kings displayed those of the Shi'ah faith, setting forth the names or the distinguishing qualities of the twelve Imams. One sovereign is said to be the servant of the king of the age, another the dog of the Commander of the Faithful.³ In both cases the allusion is said to be to one of the Imams, whose special sanctity led him to be spoken of with these titles. But when this celebrated title came to be applied to saints of a distant age, we may assume that it had long since lost its imperial significance.

It cannot be said, however, to be extinct. In a recent revolution at Constantinople the question put to the Ulema was whether it was lawful to depose the Commander of the Faithful, under the circumstances detailed. According to the principles laid down by orthodox writers, the sovereignty of

¹ Marsden, vol. ii. p. 549. The expression is curious—

في عهد الامير الخليفة لدين الله

² Marsden, vol. ii. p. 641—

بصدق ابو بكر و عدل عمر بازم عثمان و علم علي

³ Marsden, vol. ii. pp. 463, 465. The expression on the first coin is

كتب الامير المومنين , بنده شاه ولايت

the true believers must be one, indivisible, and absolute. A dictum of the Prophet is quoted in support of this, that one scabbard cannot contain two swords. Legal authorities have accordingly pronounced against any division of the empire, and against the co-existence of two Khalifs. Such dogmas have been rendered null and void by the force of events, but powerful sovereigns have re-asserted the claim, and when the Ottoman family rose to power it was asserted wherever their arms could reach. A colourable title was obtained by the cession of the rights of the last of the Abbasside Khalifs, on the conquest of Egypt by Selim, at the beginning of the sixteenth century of our era. In the year following, Selim received the homage of the Sheriff of Mecca, who presented to him the keys of the Kaaba by the hands of his son. It is laid down by legal authorities that the true Khalif must be of Koreish blood, and this double cession on the part of members of the same family is relied upon as the foundation of the spiritual claim. Bolder authorities, quoted by D'Ohsson, rest the claim to allegiance on the law of conquest, but such doctrines are not peculiar to Muhammadan lawyers.

The Empire so founded has combined the most perfect union of spiritual with temporal sway within its own dominions. According to legal phraseology, the title Sultan expresses the temporal, that of Imam, the spiritual sway of the head of the State, while that of Khalif indicates the union of the two. The latter title implies claims of rightful succession, but the career of the Khalifs presents some awkward facts, which render any such pretensions of no weight. Accordingly the true Khalifat is held, by the school whose authority is accepted by the Ottomans, to have lasted only thirty years. The title usually applied to the head of the State is that of Imam, implying only headship of the congregation, as no sacerdotal functions are exercised by the chief of the believers, beyond taking the lead in public worship; but, by an easy figure, it is applied to the headship of the Moslem world, and this supremacy has been widely recognized. When D'Ohsson wrote, it is said to have been

recognized by the Sunnis, of both Asia and Africa.¹ How tenaciously it was upheld appears from the events connected with the treaty of Kanardji, at the close of the war with Russia in 1774. One of the articles recognized the claim to civil independence of the Khan of the Crimea. This struck a blow at the spiritual claims of the Porte, and it is said that this affront to his dignity was felt more keenly than the loss of a province.²

The headship of the Ottoman sovereign over States which hold to the same doctrines has been not unfrequently recognized in very recent times; but it is difficult to pronounce how much there has been of political rather than religious motive in these transactions. It has been brought to my notice that application was made a few years since, through the British Government of Cape Colony, on behalf of the Malay settlers, for a Cadi of the true orthodox belief, and the application was graciously acceded to by the government of Constantinople. A more complete recognition of the supremacy of the Sultan has been recently offered by the chief of Kashgar. This soldier of fortune, who bore the title of Atalik Ghazi, has accepted from the Porte that of Amir which, according to Musalman tradition, expresses the relation between the Commander of the Faithful and a general of his armies. His nephew, Yakub Khan, proceeded to

¹ *Tableau Général de l'Empire Ottoman*. The work was published late in the eighteenth century. His account of the religious and civil jurisprudence is based on the *Multeka ul Abhur*, the principal work in repute throughout the empire.

² Article III. of the treaty provides for the complete independence of the Tatars of the Crimea in all civil matters, including the election of their Khans. The proviso relating to the spiritual supremacy of the Porte runs as follows: "Quant aux ceremonies de religion, comme les Tartares professent le même culte que les Musulmans ils se régleront à l'égard de sa hauteesse comme *Grand Calife du Mahometisme* selon les préceptes que leur preserit leur loi, sans aucune préjudice neanmoins de la confirmation de leur liberté politique et civile."

The attempt to distinguish between civil and religious liberty presented difficulties that threatened a new rupture. The Porte refused to recognize Shahin Gerai, and release him from obedience in temporal matters, except on the condition that the Khan should acknowledge his spiritual supremacy. But as the Court of Constantinople insisted on appointing Mollas and Cadis, as heretofore, there seemed no prospect of an adjustment. The question was finally set at rest by the Convention of Ainarly-Cawak in 1779, under the mediation of the French Government. This act was, in fact, a confirmation of that of 1774, and prepared the way for the cession of the Crimea to Russia by Shahin Gerai in 1781, which was formally recognized by the Porte in 1784.

Constantinople for the purpose of establishing a closer relation between the governments, and, on his return, it was publicly announced at the festival of the A'ed Kurban (28th January, 1874) that the Sultan had assumed the protectorate of Kashgar. This took place while Sir Douglas Forsyth's mission was at the court, and some coins were struck at the time, specimens of which have been placed in my hands. They bear merely the name of the Sultan, Abdul Aziz, with the addition, "struck at the guarded or protected (المحمروسة) Kashgar." This does not involve more than a recognition of political superiority. The word which I have rendered protected appears frequently on coins of different Mogul families in Central Asia, and has been interpreted in the sense of "fortified" or "the fort." Fraehn renders it the (divinely) guarded (divinitus custodiendæ). The recognition of the Sultan's superiority is sufficiently indicated by the use of his name, without reference to this epithet.

SHAH OR PADSHAH.

I assume that the former word is a corruption of *Kshatriya*, or rather of the word which is used for King in the ancient inscriptions of Persia. D'Herbelot does indeed show that the word *Shah* bore several significations in the ancient Persian, such as pre-eminence—the cost of anything—King or Prince; but the change from the word *K'hshayathiya*,¹ the title applied to Darius, is not difficult, and is supported by the instances given by Sir H. Rawlinson of the change from the guttural of the first letter of this title to the *sh* of modern Persian, as in the case of *K'hshapa*, 'night,' to *Shub*.² We have also words apparently derived from the same root, connected with regal government, such as *K'hshatrapa*, Satrap, in the Behistun inscription, and *Akhasteranim* of the Book of Esther.³ I cannot doubt that the name

¹ This is the rendering of Sir H. Rawlinson. That of Burnouf is *Khchayo*, which brings us still nearer to the modern word.

² Journal R.A.S. Vol. X. p. 86.

³ Chap. viii. 10, 14, where the word is rendered "camels" in the Authorized Version. The author of the Speaker's Commentary on this book considers that Haug and Bertheau have shown clearly that the word is really an adjective and means "royal."

K'hshayarsha of the Cuneiform inscriptions which is rendered Xerxes, and the *Arthk'hshatra*, Artaxerxes, are of royal significance. The use of a title as a proper name is, we have seen, of frequent usage in later times.

We have the same title slightly modified in the Zend. Haug gives, among other points of resemblance between the legends of the Zendavesta and the Veda, the general agreement in the stories of *Yima Khshaéta* and *Yámá Raja*, and he concludes that *Khshaéta* is identical with *Raja*, King. The same author traces the proper name *Shaputra* (the Sapor of Roman historians), as it appears in the inscription at Hagiabad, to *Khshathraputhra*, as it would have sounded in ancient Persian.¹ We have not the means of tracing the changes which the ancient title underwent after the fall of the Achæmenides, for the Greek language prevailed, and no inscriptions in the vernacular Persian are extant during the reigns of the dynasty of the Arsacids. We derive very little light from Persian historians, the old records being a mass of fables. It is said, indeed, by an Arabic author on geography, who wrote in the tenth century, Abu Rihan, better known as Albiruni, that the Khárismanian records show that a family named *Shahiyah*, and supposed to be descended from Cyrus, reigned over that country from the time of the Achæmenians to the Muhammadan invasion, with the exception of a Scythic interregnum of ninety-two years.² The title Shah must have prevailed in Persia during this period, though we have no direct evidence as to the sovereigns to whom it was applied. It may be sufficient to point out that when Firdusi, who wrote in the tenth century of our era, gathered up the legends of his country in his great epic, the *Shah-nameh*, it was the ordinary designation of king in the language.

It seems strange that the Sassanians, who revived the ancient religion, and employed the vernacular language on their coins and inscriptions, should have preferred a title of Arabic or Chaldee origin, *Malkan Malka*, to the old Persian title; especially as the founder of the dynasty, Artaxerxes, bore

¹ Haug's Essays, pp. 45, 234.

² Rawlinson, Essays on Central Asia, p. 246.

a name compounded of it. We are indeed told by the author of the *Zeenut-ul-Tuarick*, quoted by Malcolm, that after one of his victories he was hailed in the field with the title of *Shahan Shah*.¹ Another prince of the same dynasty, Baharam the Third, also bore, according to D'Herbelot, the same high-sounding title; but it does not appear, from the inscriptions of princes of this period, to have superseded the Semitic title which they usually bore.

After the rise of the Muhammadan power, we have frequent instances of the use of Shah as a proper name, but not as a title of sovereignty, until comparatively modern times, when it was assumed by the sovereigns of the Sufi dynasty, who reigned from the close of the fifteenth century till the time of Nadir Shah, and it is the special title of the Kings of Persia at the present day. It was a favourite title or proper name, (it is difficult to distinguish between them), of the Turks of the house of Seljuk. As they entered on their career of conquest through Kharism, it seems probable that they accepted a title which was popular in this portion of their dominions. Several of the governors of that province, under the Seljuk princes, broke loose from their dominion. Among them we have one named *Soliman Shah*, and the peculiar combination of *Sultan Shah*, a title which was also borne by one of the Seljuk princes that reigned in Kerman. Among the several branches of the Seljuk princes, I find three bearing the name of *Arslan Shah* and three of *Malik Shah*, one of whom became governor of Khorassan, under his father, Sultan of Kharism.

In all these provinces the Persian language prevailed, and the title was evidently assumed as one of honour, long recognized in the country. When I add to these instances the fact that two of the sons of Timur bore the name of Shah, *Miran Shah*, and *Shah Rokh*,² and that nearly every member of a dynasty which ruled at Shiraz in the fourteenth

¹ Malcolm's History, vol. i. p. 91.

² This title, according to D'Herbelot, was given by Timur to his son because he received tidings of his birth while playing at chess, and the father had just made the move by which the king is checkmated by the Rook or Castle. The move in Persian is called Shah Rokh.

century bore this name,¹ it is apparent that the title, though not superseding that of Sultan, was very much in use, and conjoined with it in Persia and Central Asia, very much in the same way that Malik was employed in the west.

But, during this period of Turkish domination in Asia, Persian literature was highly cultivated at many of the courts of these princes.² Persian writers of genius gave a tone to the tastes and sentiments of their rulers, as did the Greeks to their Roman conquerors, and the old regal title of the subject race came gradually into use and finally superseded those of Arabic origin.

Similar remarks will apply to the Muhammadan rulers of India, where Persian became the language of literature and of business, and Persians were largely employed in offices of trust and power. The title Shah came early into use in India, and forms part of the names of many of the Patan sovereigns, and also of the Kings of the Deccan. It is used capriciously, like any other proper name, and always as the second term. In no case is it employed as the distinguishing title of a dynasty. That of Sultan always takes the first place in inscriptions. I take an example at random from Mr. Thomas's work on the coins of these rulers, that of the thirteenth in the list. It runs thus: "The Great Sultan, Rukn-din Ibrahim Shah, son of Firuz Shah."³ Even when the title Shahinshah is employed, it occupies a second place. Thus the inscription of Muhammad bin Sam, better known as

¹ Malcolm, vol. i. p. 447.

² Mr. Elphinstone, in his *History of India*, offers some excellent remarks on the characteristics of the Arab, Tatar, and Persian races, which I should be tempted to quote, were it not for their length. The Turks have displayed great military qualities, and by force of character have maintained their dominion over subject races for centuries, both in the East and West, but, unlike the Arabs, they have, as Mr. Elphinstone remarks, neither founded a religion nor introduced a literature; and so far from impressing their own stamp on others, they have universally melted into that of the nation among whom they settled. They have, however, availed themselves of the aptitude for business shown by the conquered races, whether Persians or Hindus. The talents and ingenuity of the Persians have enabled them, though depressed by despotic rulers, to make a figure in history out of proportion to their number, or the resources of their territory.— See Elphinstone's *India*, book v. cap. iii.

³ The *Chronicles of the Pathán Kings of Dehli*, p. 155.

السلطان الاعظم ركن الدنيا والدين ابراهيم شاه بن فيروز شاه

Mahmud Ghori, on the Kutb Minar at Dehli, runs: "The mighty Sultan, the great Shahinshah," etc.¹

Light is thrown on this subject from an unexpected quarter. The inscription on the Allahabad column, in honour of Samudra Gupta, one of a line of powerful sovereigns that reigned, in the north of India, during the first centuries of the Christian era, gives an account of the nations or princes from whom he received or claimed tribute. Among them were found the titles *Devaputra*, *Shahi*, and *Shahanshahi*. Mr. James Prinsep, in his paper on this inscription,² points out that the former title, "the heaven-descended king," is analogous to the well-known triple inscription of the Parthian kings, ΕΚΓΕΝΟΥΣ ΘΕΩΝ, or to that on the Sassanian coins, "offspring of the divine race of God." It has been recently pointed out by Mr. Thomas that the terms *Devaputra* and *Shahi* appear severally on the coins of Vasudeva, Raja of Mathura. We have thus evidence of the existence of these two forms as recognized titles in India, or beyond its limits, at the period of this sovereign's reign, which has been severally referred by writers to the second, the fourth, and the fifth centuries of our era; while the Indo-Bactrian coins, on which the title *Shahi* appears, form a link by which they may be traced to their source in Central Asia.

There is no trace of it on any known inscription from this time till the tenth century of our era. Mr. R. S. Poole,³ of the British Museum, has drawn my attention to a coin of the Buweyhee family, who ruled over Fars at the latter epoch, in which the title appears. The prince's titles run *Il Malik Shahan Shah Buhá ed Dowleh*. Somewhat later it appears

¹ Selden gives several instances of the use of Shah in the middle ages, and before the assumption of the title by the reigning family of Persia; but the old writers to whom he refers are chiefly Greek. *Malik Shah* becomes Μελεξά. In some instances it is applied to the ruler of a particular country, as Κερμασσα the King of Kerma, and Σεγανσαα King of the Seganes. Selden says that the Persians call the Pope *Rumsha*. I suspect that Rum in this case is the *Rum* of the Seljuk monarchy. Selden points out that in the instances which he has come across it is applied to petty sovereigns or governors of provinces.

² Journal As. Soc. Bengal, vol. vi. p. 974.

³ Catalogue of Oriental Coins in the British Museum, vol. ii. pp. 213, 214. The coin of this prince's son is given by Mr. Stanley Lane Poole, in his paper on unedited Arabic coins, where the same title appears. Journal R.A.S. Vol. VII. p. 250.

in a title of honour conferred by the Khalif, and it may have been so in the above instance. Abulfeda, describing the reception by Malek el Adil of the embassy from the Khalif in the year 604 A.H., mentions that the envoy in conveying the diploma conferred on the prince the titles of *Shahinshah*, *Malik il Malúk*, and *Khalil Amir il Mumenin* (friend of the Commander of the Faithful). I find two other instances of its use in the same history. It appears in some complimentary verses, addressed to Fakr ud Dowleh (one of the Buweyhee family) as if it were a royal title; but in the other case it is used merely as a proper name. In recording the death of Ala-ed-din Ferukshah, he is said to be the son of Shahinshah, son of Ayub, Sahib of Balbek.

The old Persian title of king of kings had evidently lost its old significance long ere this, and we rarely find this form except buried under confused heaps of royal attributes.¹

These remarks on the title Shah form a necessary introduction to that of which it forms a component part, and which is more especially associated with imperial rule at Dehli and at Constantinople. The title Padshah is supposed to carry with it something of supreme or extended sway. The most probable etymology is from the *pati* ("powerful") of Sanskrit. Mr. Thomas and Mr. West both trace it to the *Patahshatari* of a Sassanian inscription.² It was probably the equivalent of "the Great King" of ancient titles. But it is surprising that so little trace should be found of its use in royal titles till it started into life as the special designation of these great dynasties. In the Gulistan it is used as the ordinary designation of King and the equivalent of Malik, and not implying any special pre-eminence. I may here remark that the manner in which the different titles representing royalty are employed in Persian literature is well exem-

¹ *Shahanshah* or *Shahinshah*, for the title is given in both forms, is not in the idiom of modern Persian, and various conjectures have been offered to me as to its origin. I suppose it to be merely an abridged form of the ancient title, as it was used in the time of Darius, by the reduction of the inflexion of the genitive plural *ánam* to *án*. Nadir Shah, by a simple inversion of the words, converted it into the idiom of his own age, *Shah-i-Shahan*.—Marsden, vol. ii. p. 447.

² J.R.A.S. Vol. III. n.s. p. 273; and Vol. IV. n.s. p. 401.

plified in this work. Sadi followed the fashion of the day in the use of Arabic words and expressions, and sometimes one and sometimes another is employed, without any apparent reason for the change. The title of the first book, on the manner of Kings, is in the preface, *درسیرت پادشاهان*, while in the heading of the same chapter the word *ملوک* is substituted. The first apologue commences, "I have heard of a King (*Padshah*)."¹ A few lines on the same king is spoken of as *Malik*, and then we have *Padshah*, and, in the couplet further on, *Shah* alone. In a following apologue one of the Kings of Khorassan sees Sultan Mahmud in a dream. *Malik* is applied to the former, while Mahmud retains that which is associated with his name in history.

In the adulatory panegyric on his patron, the Atabek, in the preface, these different titles are jumbled together independent of all rules of linguistic origin. He is the *Padshah* of Islam, the great *Shahinshah*, *Khudawend* of the world, great *Atabek*, *Sultan* of land and sea, *Malik* of the necks of nations, *Muli* (Master) of the Kings of Arabia and Persia,¹ Great *Amir*, with many others.

I am unable to state at what period it was first used by the Sultans of Constantinople. When Selden wrote, its assumption by these sovereigns attracted attention from its novelty. He says: "The Grand Seignior hath instead of this, (the title of Caliph), in later times rather used the title of

¹ That is, *مولی ملوک العرب والعجم*. The first word of this title is familiar to us from its having been borne by the barbarian rulers of Morocco in recent times. Muley is prefixed to these names, but the title runs as above, *Muli Malik*, or, as it is usually written, *Muley Moloch*. The full title quoted above is not uncommon, and may be found, for example, in the inscription of the titles of Musáud on the minaret near Ghazni. In the inflected form *Múlana*, our master, it forms the heading of the complimentary titles addressed to Abulfeda, and quoted by Reinaud in the preface to his geography, and is the term of respect commonly used in addressing learned persons, such as judges. It was the custom to address the Khalif in Egypt by this form. The fact is mentioned by William of Tyre, in his narrative of the events connected with an embassy to the Court at Cairo, in 1167 A.D., quoted by De Guignes (vol. ii. p. 195). The only instances of its appearance on coins of ruling princes that I have met with are given by Marsden. The first is on a coin of a Turkoman-Ortokite prince. It contains a curious jumble of titles, "Il-Ghazi, our master (Múlana), the just, wise Málík, Kotb-ed-din, Malik al Omra, Shah of Diarbekr." It is inferred from the use of the inflected form, implying a dedication, that it was struck by some vassal or prefect. The other instance occurs on a coin of the first King of Oudh, who had a great reputation for learning.—Marsden, vol. i. p. 119, and vol. ii. p. 698.

پادشاه مسلمان, *Padshah Musulmin*, that is, Great King or Emperor of the Musulmans, Padshah being in Turkish and Persian, a Great King or Emperor, whence they call the German Emperor *Urum Padshah*, or the Emperor of Rome, the French King, *Frank Padshah*. Another Great Mogor also in his title styles himself by the same name of Padshah." Selden mentions, further on, that he had, through Sir Thomas Roe, the advantage of seeing it on the seal of the Great Mogor, as he calls him. It was at this time the proper designation of the rulers of Dehli. Baber informs us that he assumed it after his first expedition to India. After recounting the events of an important year, he says, "Till this time the family of Timur Beg, even although on the throne, had never assumed any other title than that of Mirza. At this period I ordered that they should style me Padshah." The translator of the Memoirs points out that Baber had applied it to himself before this time, and indeed in the very opening of his Memoirs he says, "I became Padshah of Ferghana." In another passage I observe that the term is applied, in the sense of royal, to a garden in the neighbourhood of Cábul. It is called *Bagh-i-Padshahi*.

There was not a little ostentatious rivalry between these two great Courts, which led Jehangir, the grandson of Baber, to assume a high-sounding title, in order, as is said in his memoirs, to place himself on a level with the sovereigns of the Turkish empire of the West. "From my father's anointed lips," he says, "I never heard myself called by the name of Muhammad Selim, Baba being the paternal appellation by which he invariably addressed me, and perhaps I might have been contented to the last with the title of Sultan Selim; but to place myself on a par with the monarchs of Roum, and considering that universal conquest is the peculiar vocation of princes, I thought it incumbent on me to assume at my accession that of Jehangir Padshah, as a title which best suited my character."

The name of Selim, which Jehangir thought unfit for a reigning prince, was borne, however, by several princes of the line of Othman. The ostentation of the latter was shown

in their selection of titles and in their multiplication. To that of Padshah they are said to have attached such importance that they were very guarded in recognizing Christian princes of Europe by this title. D'Herbelot says: "Le Sultan des Turks est tellement jaloux de ce titre, qu'il ne communiquoit autrefois qu'au seul roi de France entre tous les rois Chrétiens. Mais depuis peu les rois d'Angleterre l'ont aussi obtenu de lui à force de présents. Car pour l'Empereur et pour le roi d'Espagne le Sultan ne leur donne que les titres de *Czar*, que signifie Roi en esclavon."

The Turks have been compelled to bend to the force of circumstances by other influences than that of money. In seeking the alliance of Western powers, they have been obliged, even in old times, to accept conditions of equality in styles of address. Selden mentions a treaty between Rodolph II. and the Grand Seignior Ahmed in the year 1606, to the effect that in all letters and instruments between them they should not be styled by any other additions than by the name of well-beloved father and son; the Emperor calling the Sultan his son, and the Sultan the Emperor, in regard of his years, his father; and that in the beginning of their letters they might both indifferently take upon them the name of Emperor. In later times the equality of the relations between the Ottoman sovereign and the Czar of Russia has been exhibited in the mutual recognition of the other by the title of Padshah. The first article of the treaty of peace between Russia and Turkey in 1829 runs thus: "Tout inimitié et tout differend qui ont subsisté jusqu'à présent entre les deux empires cesseront, à dater de ce jour, tant sur terre que sur mer, et il y aura à perpétuité paix amitié et bonne intelligence entre S.M. l'Empereur et *Padshah* de toutes les Russies et S.H. l'Empereur et *Padshah* des Ottomans, leurs héritiers et successeurs aux trônes, aussi qu'entre leurs empires."

I should add, in concluding my remarks on this title, that it has been exempt from the same courses of degradation which seem to belong to Oriental titles. It has never been employed as a proper name, nor has it, except in one in-

stance, been applied in modern times to any sovereigns but those of the highest rank, and who are usually styled Emperors by European writers. The exception is in the case of the Vizier of Oudh. When that prince was encouraged by Lord Hastings to assume a regal title, he took that of Padshah. His titles are given at length, as they appear in his correspondence, in Marsden's work, and are as follows:—His highness, our master (Múlana), Abu'l-zufur, Maz-uddin, Shah zaman, Ghazi-uddin Haider, Padshah Ghazi.¹

KHAN OR KHACAN.

The history of this title is not dissimilar to that of Malik or Shah. It has been the distinguishing title of the sovereigns of great monarchies, and afterwards degraded by its application to petty chiefs or princes, until it was used merely as a title of honour, or usurped as a proper name, and applied indiscriminately to high and low. The title became first known in Europe with the advance of the Turkish hordes, who penetrated to the Danube in the fifth century, and was borne by the chiefs of the Avares and of the Turks or Huns.² For the early history of these migrations we

¹ Marsden, vol. ii. p. 698—

حضرت مولانا ابوالظفر معز الدین شاہ زمن غازی الدین حیدر
پادشاہ غازی.

These titles are given, slightly varied, in Wilson's History of British India (vol. ii. p. 504). The assumption gave offence at the Court of Dehli, as the title assumed was identical with that hitherto borne by the Mogul princes only. It was accordingly changed to the more modest designation of Padshah of Oudh.

Since these pages were in type, I have met with another instance of the assumption of this title by a prince of inferior rank. During the events which led to the rise of Yakub Khan, as narrated by a member of the mission of Sir Douglas Forsyth, several chiefs appear to have risen to power in Eastern Turkistan, when the Chinese authority was shaken after the capture of Pekin, and among others, an old man of sanctity, Abbibullah, headed the insurrection in Khoten, and assumed the government with the title of Khan Padshah. Had the Muhammadan dominion in India not been rudely cut short by British power, I do not doubt but that Padshahs would, ere long, have become as plentiful as Sultans or Khans.

² The Avares became known to the Roman Emperors after the fall of the dominion of Attila. I do not find any mention of any native titles borne by the chiefs of the first Tatar invaders of Europe. It is the conjecture of Prichard that Attila may have derived his name from *Atalik*, the Turkish word for guardian, and he supposes that Attila ruled as guardian of his nephew. It seems more

are chiefly dependent on the annals of China. The Turks, wherever they spread, adopted the religion, the manners, and the literature of the conquered races, and the attempts of native writers in after-times to trace their history are legendary and untrustworthy. It appears from the Chinese records that they were united in powerful monarchies on the north of China in the beginning of the second century before our era. The identity of the Huns, as known to Europe, with the Turks, is clearly made out by the labours of De Guignes¹ and Remusat. The head of the Government bore the title of *Tanjou* or *Chen-ju*, meaning, in the language of the Huns, the Son of Heaven.² The Government was divided under two great officers, each of whom, according to De Guignes, bore the title of King, that is, as he afterwards explains, the *Hien-vam* of the left and of the right, the former being the heir presumptive of the throne. The *Tanjou* held great diets at certain seasons, to which resorted all the great officers of state and captains of their forces; the object being, as is said, to perform sacrifices; but, in these vast camps were organized the military and predatory expeditions which rendered them so terrible to their Chinese neighbours. The policy of the latter resembled that which was afterwards pursued by the Emperors of Constantinople, but with greater success; they fomented dissensions, employed the arms of some of the Tatar princes in their service, and maintained an unequal struggle with their dangerous neighbours until the Empire of the Huns or Turks

probable to suppose that Attila, whose government was well established before he became terrible by his European conquests, assumed an European title, just as the Turkish conquerors who followed him borrowed the titles of their subjects. The work quoted by De Guignes says: "Il prenoit le titre de par la grace de Dieu, Roi des Huns, des Medes, des Goths, des Danois, la terreur de l'univers et le fleau de Dieu." The Byzantine writers of the time of Justinian give to the chief of the Avars the title of *Chagan*.

¹ I refer more particularly to an essay by De Guignes in the twenty-eighth volume of the *Mémoires de l'Académie des Inscriptions*, where the subject is fully treated. They were known to the contemporary European writers by the name of Huns, while the orientals called them Turks. The powerful nation to the north of China bore the name of *Hion-nou*. The *Tiou-kiou*, which we are told is the Chinese mode of spelling the name *Turk*, formed a branch of the former.

² The full title is *Tcem-li-ko-to-tan-jou*, of which the above is the abbreviation. This is explained variously as "the Son of Heaven," or, "la grande ressemblance du fils de ciel."—De Guignes, vol. i. p. 25.

broke up and spread over Tatar, or penetrated to Europe. After successive revolutions, a new and powerful State rose on its ruins, under the rule of a soldier of fortune named *Tou-lun*, whose kingdom became the most powerful in Tatar. This prince was, according to De Guignes, the first to assume the title of *Khan* or *Khacan*, and that only after arriving at the height of his fame. This was at the commencement of the fifth century of our era.¹

The first assumption of a title probably means no more than that it was under this prince it became, for the first time, connected with the rule of a great potentate. There seems reason to suppose that it was in use in far more ancient times. The Scythic version of the Behistun inscription, as interpreted by the late Dr. Norris, gives the word *Ko* as the equivalent of King, that is, the *Khshayathiya* of the Persian version. The title of Darius runs: *Ko irsarra, Ko Ko-fa-inna*, the Great King, King of Kings.² The decipherment proceeds on the supposition that the original inscription was written in a language akin to the Ugrian division of the Tatar or Mongolian language, and that this dialect was spoken by the nomad population under the Persian dominion. It will not, I trust, be considered far-fetched to suppose that in this word we have the origin of a title which in later times is associated with Tatar dominion. It is perhaps more to the purpose to point out that when the Tatar hordes came into conflict with the power of Rome, in the fifth and sixth centuries, nearly every chief bore the title of Khan or Khacan. The Turks especially, who had arrived at great power and great pretensions, were governed by a chief who took the title of the Great Khan, corresponding with that which was afterwards borne by the successors of Jengiz Khan, a title implying a ruler over subordinate chiefs or Khans. Gibbon dwells at some length on the relations between the Byzantine Emperor and the head of this government, and describes the state of the court of the Great Khan, which is somewhat vaguely described as being placed at the foot of

¹ De Guignes, vol. i. p. 337.

² Journ. R.A.S. Vol. XV.

the Altai range, and as maintained with a barbaric splendour similar to that of former dignitaries in the north of China. His pretensions may be gathered from the terms of the letter which he addressed to the Emperor Maurice, in which he styles himself lord of the seven races and of the seven climates.¹

In De Guignes's account of the revolutions of Tatory, from the fifth to the tenth century, the title of Khan is applied to all chiefs of hordes, and any prince who could bring a large number of these tribes under his rule became a Great Khan.² But when the Chinese government recovered its authority over a great part of Tatory, they disposed of the title of Khan at their pleasure. It was indeed conferred upon dignitaries or governors, whether subject to Chinese or Turkish power. When the ambassadors of Tiberius II. were sent to renew the former alliance with the Turkish government, they are said to have arrived at a place under the rule of a chief named Tourxanth, and it is the conjecture of De Guignes that this was no other than Tarkhan or Tourkhan, a title known to the Turkish governments.³ But there is no lack of evidence of the prevalence of the title in Tatory until the time when the Turkish power penetrated through Transoxiana into Khorassan and Western Asia. It seems the more surprising that, when these conquests were achieved, they dropped the ancient title of the sovereigns of these races. Whether it was that in the process of assimilation with the conquered races, and with a new religion and manners, they assumed the titles and prerogatives already

¹ Selden gives the heading of the letter from the Greek chronicler. It runs thus: *Ἐν βασιλείᾳ τῶν Ῥωμαίων ὁ χαγαβὸς ὁ μέγας δεσποτὴς ἑπτα γένων καὶ κυρίου κλιματῶν τῆς οἰκουμένης ἑπτα*. The seven climates means the whole world. In Persian literature we have seven heavens, seven earths, seven planets, seven members of the body, seven styles of writing, and so on *ad infinitum*. Seven is a mystic number, and is used to classify the whole order of creation. Baber, at the opening of his Memoirs, says that the country of Ferghana is situated in the fifth climate, on the extreme border of the habitable world. The seventh climate is Hindustan. For an account of the seven climates I refer the reader to Es Mas'udi's Meadows of Gold, Sprenger's translation, p. 197.

² De Guignes, vol. i. p. 494.

³ The leader of the Bulgarians, when they became first known in Europe in the sixth century, was *Zabergan* (Gibbon, cap. xliii.). These invaders were certainly of Tatar origin.—De Guignes, vol. i. p. 395.

current in those countries ; or whether the title had already undergone degradation, by being applied to chiefs of small authority, the rising power thought it politic to drop a title, now too common, and the title itself became extinct as representing kingly power. In Fraehn's specimens of the coins of the Khans of Turkistan, belonging to the close of the tenth and beginning of the eleventh centuries, I find rare instances of the use of the title. The inscriptions are in Arabic, and have the usual Muhammadan symbols, and are said to have been struck, in nearly all the instances where the inscription is legible, by the order of the Amir Arslan, or other ruler, with occasional references to their devotion to the Commander of the Faithful. The titles Malik and Padshah also appear, and, where Khan or Khacan is brought in, it is generally additional or supplemental. For example, the sixth on the list runs: "Est ex iis (numis) quos (cudi) jussit Emirus. . . . Chakanus, quem Deus corroboret." There are, however, some instances where it takes the place of Amir, as in No. 55, where the coin is said to be struck by the order of the most illustrious Khan Kotb ed-dawla (البحان الاجل قطب الدولة) and some others. The title was evidently falling out of use. I find no trace of its use by the Seljuk monarchs, nor by the Atabegs or other princes of Turkish origin who preceded the irruption of the Moguls; nor have I met with any instance of its appearance as a royal title borne by any sovereign of the early Muhammadan dynasties of India, unless it be in the case of Musaud, the son of Mahmud, where the title Khacan appears among those set forth on the minaret near Ghazni.¹ As a title of honour it appears frequently in Indian history. In the description of the Indian Government, by a native of Damascus, in the thirteenth century, quoted in Elliot's *Historians*, which has been already referred to, the Khans are said to be highest in dignity, and they numbered more than eighty.

Instances are given in the same work of its being combined with epithets, in the same way as the title Malik was

¹ *Journal Asiatic Society of Bengal*, vol. xxii. pp. 77, 78.

used in Western Asia. As *Khan-i Azim*, a foundling, of Turki origin, who was brought up by the Sultan, and received from him in the first instance the title of *Tatar Malik*, which was afterwards exchanged for the higher dignity of *Tatar Khan*. We hear also of *Khan-i Jahan*, Khan of the World, and in Jehangir's Memoirs I find the titles *Khan Khanan* and *Khan-i Azim*. The practice of conferring this dignity continued during this reign, and is mentioned in the same Memoirs. But Khans multiplied fast in the times which succeeded, and, in the confusion which followed the breaking up of this empire, it was open to any one to assume it; until, latterly, it became so common that Colonel Yule puts it on a par with the title of Esquire in England. It is needless to trace its history further in this direction.

With the conquest of the Moguls in the thirteenth century the title Khan or Khacan came again into use in Southern Asia, and was borne by Jengiz Khan and by his descendants, as by his rivals. I do not pretend to offer a solution of the threefold form in which the name appears,—Khan, Khacan, and Kaan.¹ The two former appear in the Arabic inscriptions on the coins of Jengiz Khan, the last on that of his grandson Hulaku. In the specimens of the coins of this great barbarian conqueror given by Mr. Thomas, the inscription runs simply, "The Just, the Great Jengiz Khan," or, "The Just, the Great Khacan."² That of Hulaku has been given above. The title of Kublai is spelt the same way in Abulfaraj.³ The same form is applied by Marco Polo to "The Great Kaan," a title which he says signifies "The Great Lord of Lords," or "Emperor."⁴ It has been supposed that these three forms have the same origin and meaning. The transition from the longer to the shorter form is an easy one, and as the title of Jengiz Khan is

¹ خان خاقان قان

² Chronicles of the Pathan Kings of Dehli, pp. 91, 92.

العدل الاعظم جنكز خان عدل خاقان الاعظم

³ قوبلاي قان

⁴ Book ii. 1.

spelt, according to Remusat, *Kho-han*, it seems probable that *Khan* is a simple contraction of the longer forms. It is clear, however, that some special importance has always been attached to the title *Khacan*, and while *Khan* has long been used as a proper name, the other has been reserved for the titles of great sovereigns, and appears in those of India as well as of those of Constantinople. The wars, conquests, and extended dominions of the Moguls has given a great prestige to the title, but it has never superseded any of the current titles in Southern Asia. The members of the family of Jengiz Khan who established themselves in Persia and in *Kapchak*, fell back on the old title of *Sultan*, and the rulers of Constantinople are better known as *Sultan*, *Grand Seignior*, or the *Porte*, than by that which betokens their Tatar origin.

The title of Great Khan is chiefly connected with the fame of the great Empire in the far East, though it has been shown that the same title had been in use before the time of Jengiz Khan. The progress of the Moguls had proved more disastrous to the Muhammadans than to the Christians, and the latter turned hopefully to the East to cultivate the rising power. Embassies from the Pope, from Louis IX., and still more, the narrative of Marco Polo, brought to Europe reports of the power and grandeur of the Great Khan. The enthusiasm of the latter especially knows no bounds, when he comes to this part of his story. After describing the title of Kublai, which he translates "the Great Lord of Lords," he adds, "And of a surety he had good right to such a title, for all men know for a certain truth that he is the most potent man, as regards forces and lands and treasure, that existeth in the world, or ever hath existed from the time of our first father Adam until this day." In another passage, giving the genealogy of Kublai, he says that his power is greater than the five princes who reigned in succession from Jengiz. "Nay," he adds, "I will say more; for if you were to put together all the Christians of the world, with their Emperors and their Kings, the whole of these Christians—aye, and throw in the Saracens to boot—would

not have such power, or be able to do as much as this Cublai, who is the lord of all the Tartars in the world, those of the Levant and of the Ponent included, for they are all his liegemen and subjects." It is not surprising that some confusion should occasionally arise in the accounts received of this distant prince. Rubruquis, quoted by Selden, gives a different interpretation of the meaning of Khan from that of Polo: "*Can nomen dignitatis, quod idem est qui divinator. Omnes divinatores vocant Can. Unde principes dicuntur Can quia penes eos spectat regimen populi per divinationem.*" Selden adds: "Unless we should read *dominatores* and *dominationem*, he was deceived." Certainly Rubruquis was deceived in attributing the influence of these princes to the practice of the arts. Divination was practised, but by professional adepts. Marco Polo gives an account of these performances, by the desire of Jengiz, and before the great battle which was to decide the fate of Prester John. The diviners, who are said to have been Christians, commenced by splitting a cane; they are then said to have read a psalm from the Psalter, and to have gone through "other incantations," whereupon the cane which bore the name of Jengiz Khan advanced to the other and got on the top of it, thus foretelling the fate of Jengiz's rival.

By Byzantine and mediæval chroniclers we have the title variously *Cham*, *Chan*, *Chagan*, and *Carchan*, which latter Selden assumes to be *Cara Chan*, or Black Lord. There is also *Замергав*¹ or *Xavyavos* of the times of Justinian and Maurice, but there is one rendering or translation of the name to which Selden thought it necessary to give a precise contradiction. Some traveller, whose experiences are recorded in Latin, styles the great chief "Magnum Canem." Selden gives an extract of a work by Mathew or Michow, "a Polonian," to the following effect:—

"Imperator eorum (Tartarorum) Ir-Tli-ki, linguâ ipsorum, hoc est, liber homo, dicitur. Dicitur et *Ulu Cham*, quod sonat magnus dominus, sive magnus imperator. *Ulu N.* magnus, *Cham*, vero Dominus et imperator est. Eundem

¹ This I assume to be the Zabergan of the Bulgarians.

aliqui Magnum Canem dixerunt, et male interpretati sunt, quia *Ulu Cham* non significat Magnum Canem; *Cham* etenim cum aspiratione dominum et imperatorem, et *Cam* sine aspiratione, cruorem et numquam canem sermone Tartarorum significat."

Selden, in a note, says: "Imperator canis dicitur ubique Odorico in itinerario, et J. de Plano Carpini." The former work is in Hakluyt. The heading of a leading chapter runs "de Gloriâ Magni Canis."

With the decline of the power of the Moguls the title of Great Khan disappears from history. When the Manchus restored Tatar rule in China, they reigned as Sons of Heaven, and not as Khans. Though Timur took offence when the title was omitted in the letter he received from the Sultan of Egypt, and the title Khacan appears among the numerous titles heaped together in the Khutbeh, which I have quoted above, it is clear that he attached more value to that of Amir or Sultan than to the old Tatar title. On his coins containing the double inscription of the representative of the effete Mogul dynasty, Sultan Mahmud Khan, his own name appears simply as the Amir Timur Kur Kan or Gurghan. I have already said that it was not used in the styles of his descendants in India, notwithstanding their pride in their Mogul descent. The title however survived, and is still in use in Central Asia. It was preserved for some time by a family that claimed descent from Jengiz. But Russian progress has reduced the list of those who reign by this title, and it seems probable that ere long it will be extinct, except as a mere honorary or personal title, as is the case in India. It is significant of the decline of the title that the only two families which have risen to importance in Central Asia in recent times have restored the old title of Amir—the princes ruling in Bochara and in Cábul.

It remains only to add a few words on the use of this title by princes of the Ottoman line. Their origin is traced to one of the military chiefs of the army of a Sultan of Kharism, who contended for many years against the power of the Moguls. Gibbon, following the guidance of De

Guignes, who has treated the subject critically, supposes him to have been the chief of a Turkoman horde; but the traditions are obscure, and the name of the ancestor, Soliman Shah, does not sound like that of a Tatar chief. The names of his successors, Orthogrul and Thaman, or Othman, are supposed to be Turkish, and that of Orkhan (اورخان) is, certainly, of Tatar origin. This latter prince, who was the real founder of the Ottoman power, is said by Gibbon to have been content with the title of Amir. This is hardly borne out by the specimen which I have quoted from Selden, but it may be observed that Khan does not appear in that string of titles; and from the practice of the Ottoman princes applying, on their coinage, the title Khan to deceased sovereigns only, and not to those reigning,—a fact pointed out by Marsden,—we may infer that it was only regarded as a cognomen, and not as a royal title. After the conquest of Constantinople, the title Khacan came into use. The titles of Murad III. run: “Sultan of the two continents and Khacan of both seas, Sultan, son of a Sultan,”¹ a title borrowed from the Greek Emperors. That of Ahmad I. bears the same inscription, with the addition of “Sultan Ahmad, son of Muhammad Khan,”² marking a distinction between the two forms of this title.

HINDU TITLES.

I conclude this review with a brief reference to the titles in use in ancient India and by Hindu sovereigns. A distinction has been drawn between the regal title *Rajá* and its compounded forms, *Maharaja* and *Adhiraja* (Great King or Supreme King), as if the latter were especially reserved to sovereigns of extended dominions, and ruling over tributary princes. The inscription of Chandragupta on the Buddhist Tope at Sanchi, combines the two forms in one title *Maharajádhiraja*, and Mr. James Prinsep, in his translation,

¹ السلطان البرين و خاقان البكرين السلطان بن السلطان.

² السلطان احمد بن محمد خان.

renders it "The Great Emperor."¹ Prof. Wilson, on the other hand, referring to one of the oldest bilingual coins of Bactria, regards the title Maharaja as carrying with it no more than the bare title king, in oriental phraseology.² We may, I think, assume that the compound form was originally employed to express higher rank or extended sway,³ like the title of "Great King" in Greek inscriptions; but it would not appear, from the examples I have been able to refer to, that any broad distinction was maintained between this title and the simpler form, as between emperor and king; while, in later times, they were synonymous. Mr. Thomas has, indeed, in his illustrations of the Gupta Surashtran coins, drawn a distinction between one of these compound forms, *Rajādhiraja*, and another employed by the same sovereign, with the superlative *Maha* prefixed, as if the latter carried with it something imperial. He remarks: "The intention of this titular discrimination, as I understand it, was to mark the relative grades of Kumara's dignity. I suppose the class of coins, of which No. 17 is the representative, to have constituted the currencies of the prince while acting as a viceroy on the part of his father in the kingdom of Guzerat. He was then a 'King over kings,' but not a 'Great King over kings,' as he became in later days, on his accession to his father's imperial throne, and the position of Lord Paramount of India."⁴

Such distinctions may have prevailed, in court language, at different times; but it would require further evidence to show that they were permanently or broadly established. On the other hand, I may point to the interesting records of Aṣoka, the extent of whose dominions is traced by the remarkable inscriptions that have been deciphered in Cuttack,

¹ Journal Asiatic Society Bengal, vol. vi. p. 456.

² Wilson's *Ariana*, p. 242.

³ We find three different forms in the ancient literature. *Adhiraja* is rendered by Böhtlingk and Roth "überhaupt, herrscher über alle," and reference is made to the Rig-Veda x., and the Atharva-Veda vi., and also to the Nirukta. Instances are given, in the same dictionary, of the use of the title *Maharaja*. It is rendered "fürst, ein regierender Fürst, Landesherr," and we are referred for instances to the Aitareya Brahmana, Satapatha Brahmana, etc. The title *Raja* is the general appellation for king.

⁴ Burgess's Report on the Antiquities of Khatiawadh and Kachh, p. 61.

Guzerat, and beyond the Indus. This sovereign, in his edicts, was content with the simple designation, *Devanam piyo Piyadasa Raja*, "The King Piyadasa, Beloved of the Gods." These ancient inscriptions, the oldest probably extant, favour the supposition of the moderation in the styles in use in the most ancient times.¹

Maharaja and Adhiraja appear also on the Bactrian coins as the equivalent of *Βασιλεὺς μέγας* of the Greek kings, the successors of Alexander; and, in the same collection, we meet with a liberal use of epithets, also in imitation of the Greeks, as the pious, the unconquered, the preserver (*σωτήρ*). As an example of these swelling styles, I take that of Azes, who is supposed to have reigned in the first century B.C. It runs, *Maharajasa Rajádhirajasa Mahatasa Ayasa*, "Of the Great Aya, the Great King, the Great King of Kings."² Besides these combinations, we find the old style *Kshatrapa*, Satrap, in occasional use, and joined to that of king. In the translation of one of the oldest inscriptions of the Sah Kings of Surashtra, in Mr. Burgess's recently published Archaeological Survey of Western India, the royal title is given, "King Kshaharatra Satrapa Mahapana." The legend, in Indian Pali, on a bilingual coin of the same dynasty, in Mr. Burgess's work, is *Rajna Mahakshatrapa*, clearly implying independent sovereignty. The Greek version is not given; but as the word Satrap does not appear in the ancient literature of India,³ it seems reasonable to infer that it was introduced from the West. Another title applied to a sovereign of the South of India might be supposed to carry with it

¹ Journal R.A.S., Vols. XII. and XVI.

² Wilson's Ariana.

³ In Böhtlingk and Roth's dictionary the word is dismissed with the remark "Auf Münzen" (on coins), with references to the *Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes*. In the same dictionary the word *Kshattra* is rendered "Herrschaft, obergewalt, macht, imperium." It would be interesting to trace the history of this latter word, the derivative of which, *Kshatriya*, came to be the kingly appellation in Persia in the time of the Achæmenides, while that of Raja held its ground in India. Prof. Monier Williams, in his dictionary, offers the following remark on this subject: "KSHATRA, dominion, power, governing body, the members of which in the earliest times, as represented in the Vedic hymns, were generally called *Rajanya*, not *Kshatriya*; afterwards, when the difference between Brahman and Kshatra, or the priestly and civil orders, became more distinct, the reigning or military caste accepted the title *Kshatriya*."

something imperial, were there reason to suppose that it had acquired any extensive currency. In a grant quoted by Mr. Fergusson,¹ in his Essay on Indian Chronology, from the Journal of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society, the following passage occurs: "His son, Satyáśraya, Lord of the Earth, and King of Kings, much devoted to war, and to whom all kings paid homage, gained by the defeat of *Sri Harshavardhan*, the name of *Paraméśvara*" (supremely powerful). The full title runs: *Satyáśraya Sri Prithivi Vallabha, Maharaja Adhiraja Paraméśvara*. The latter appellation is a combination of epithets applied to the gods of the Hindu pantheon, and I give it, rather as a specimen of the adulatory style in use among Hindu sovereigns, than as betokening regal sway.

The examples I have given will be sufficient to illustrate the styles in use under Hindu sovereigns. They admit of very little variety or combination, and are, on the whole, more simple in character than those which have been employed in Western Asia. The titles Raja and Maharaja have held their ground, and are applied to sovereign rulers to the present day; but, like those in use among the Muhammadans, they have been rendered common by being used as titles of rank, and are now conferred as such by the British Government.

CONCLUSION.

In bringing to a close this sketch of the history of Royal and Imperial titles, I have no remarks to add beyond those which will naturally suggest themselves to the reader of these pages. Every title, with scarcely an exception, has shared in the vicissitudes of empires. They have risen or fallen with dynasties. Superstitious importance has attached to the use of some that have been associated with great families; and illustrations have been given of the nice distinctions which have prevailed as to the use of this or that title in particular countries. With this evidence before us of the ephemeral

¹ Journ. R.A.S. Vol. IV. n.s. p. 92.

character of such designations, it is to be regretted that we meet with so many instances in literature of the resort to fancied equivalents for Eastern titles in those of Europe. Eastern names and titles are now tolerably familiar to Western ears, and translators would do well to let the reader know the exact terms they find employed in the original works. Thus, many of these titles are familiar to us from our infancy. The Crusaders knew that they were contending with a "Sultan" in the person of Saladin, and this particular title has been, since that period, invariably associated with Turkish dynasties. The fame of the "Great Khan" has spread all over the world; and the title of "Commander of the Faithful" is well known to readers of the Arabian Nights. All that is necessary is to keep in mind the epoch and the circumstances under which a particular title is employed. We may, in popular language, apply the titles King and Emperor to Eastern sovereigns as denoting the independent or extended character of their rule; but, when the acts or edicts of these princes are referred to, we ought to know the nature of the title assumed, and the importance attached to it at the time.¹

It must not be supposed that, in the preceding remarks, I am offering any comment on the political incident which led me, in the first instance, to enter on this historical review. Since this paper was in the hands of the printer, it has been announced that our sovereign is to bear in India the title of *Kaisar-i Hind*; a solution of the controversy which has, I think, taken the world by surprise. We had been

¹ For example, some memorial verses, said to have been composed on the capture of Dehli by Timur, and quoted from the *Malfuzat-i-Timuri* in Sir H. Elliot's posthumous work, describe the conqueror as, "The Emperor, Sahib Kiran." It would be interesting to know the actual title applied to Timur at this period of his career. That of Sahib Kiran, lord of the (planetary) conjunctions, was constantly employed by him, and also by his descendants, and even by Nadir Shah. D'Herbelot says that Timur did not assume the title of Sultan till late in his career. The simplicity of his customary style has been already adverted to. The designation Gurgan, in which he took a pride, is said by Malcolm to have been a family name, meaning, I suppose, that it had been borne by some member or members of his family; for family names, in the European sense, are unknown to Muhammadans. D'Herbelot says it bears the signification of "Gendre et allié des rois." I find it on a coin of one of his descendants (Fraehn, p. 434).

led to infer, from the announcement of the Prime Minister, that no Asiatic designation or title would be employed, that the European title Empress would be used untranslated. The new designation steers clear of all controversy as to the employment of a title of Aryan or Semitic origin; and it is said to be one still recognized as imperial in the East. Of this I am no judge. I may, however, add, that the title Cæsar has undergone almost as many changes as some of those referred to in the preceding sketch.

From a family name it became a proper designation of the recognized successors to the imperial dignity. Latterly all the sons of the reigning prince were called Cæsars. After the creation by Alexius of the dignity of Sebastocrator, the title Cæsar became a bare title of honour, both being held inferior to that of Despot. For illustration I refer to Ducange, *Glossarium ad Scriptores mediæ et infimæ Græcitatæ*, under the title *Καῖσαρ*.

The importance of this title in public estimation survived the degradation it underwent; for it has, in modern history, been used as synonymous for Emperor, and the German Emperor is best known in popular language as the Kaiser. It is, indeed, contended by Goldastus, the author of a learned work on the Constitutions of the Empire, that it was not used by Charlemagne and his successors. Selden, however, gives an instance of its use in Charlemagne's time, in a document quoted by this author, and he contends that Cæsar was used in the German language and in that of Europe as the equivalent of Imperator. Of this he gives a curious illustration, taken from the correspondence between Elizabeth of England and the Grand Signior Amurath III., and also from a treaty between these sovereigns, where the terms Cæsar and Cæsarea Majestas are applied to the latter.

I may add, in further illustration, that the form of the oath, taken by Charles V. before his coronation at Bologna, as quoted by Selden, runs as follows: "Ego Carolus, Romanorum rex, et brevi, Dei gratia, *futurus Cæsar*, per Deum Divumque Petrum promitto," etc.

In Eastern literature the title is in frequent use as belong-

ing to the head of the Roman Empire, as in the passage quoted above from the *Malfuzat-i-Timuri*, or in the well-known lines—

The spider holds the veil in the palace of Cæsar,
The owl stands sentinel on the watch-tower of Afrasiab.¹

In Abul Farage's history of dynasties, the whole series of Roman Emperors, from Augustus to Heraclius, that is, till the rise of the Muhammadan power, figure as Cæsars. The only recorded instance which I have met with of its assumption by an Eastern sovereign is somewhat doubtful. D'Herbelot says, on the authority of a Persian historian, that Feridun, a prince of the first dynasty, portioned out his dominions among his sons before his death, and assigned to Salm, the eldest, his acquisitions in the West, with the title of Cæsar; the second received the territory occupied by Turks and Moguls, with the title of Faghfur; the youngest received Persia, Irak, etc., with the title of Shah. In another passage the dominions assigned to Salm are described as the country of Rûm. This may be taken as evidence of popular usage in the application of the title to the rulers of Asia Minor.

Gibbon says that Bayazid was styled by his cotemporaries, and even by Timur himself, *Kaisar of Rûm*, a title which he regards as foreshadowing the conquest of Constantinople;² but Rûm, in this case, as in the preceding, comprises a portion of Asia Minor and the adjoining countries, and is thus described by Arabian geographers.

These instances will suffice to show in what sense the title was used in the middle ages; they scarcely amount to a recognition of it as the equivalent for Emperor. If it has acquired the import, it must have been by modern usage.

As to the title of Emperor itself, I do not suppose it to have been ever well known in the East. When Abulfeda

پردہ داری میکند در قصر قیصر عنکبوت¹
بوہی نونت میزند در کنبد افراسیاب

I have given Sir William Jones's translation in the text.

² Cap. 65.

gives an account of the embassy sent by the Mamluk prince, Malik il Daher Bibars, to the Emperor Frederick II., he gives him his proper title under the designation *Anberatur* (الانبراطور), which he explains as meaning, according to the Franks, Malik of Amirs (ملك الامرا).

With regard to the territorial designation *Hind*, it is open to the remark that it in no way represents the extent of British dominion, still less British authority. It may be of interest to add that it was used to measure the extent of the dominions of Mahmud, as they are defined in the lines of Firdousi, which proclaim him the Shah of Rúm and of Hind. In the dedication of his great work to his patron, he describes a great prince advancing in all the pomp and circumstance of war. He inquires of a bystander the name of the conqueror, and he receives for answer, "This is the Shah of Rúm and of Hind, extending from Kanauj to the shores of Sind"

يكي گفت اين شاه روم است و هند
ز قانوج تا پيش دريائي سند

And it is further added, "This is Mahmud, the Great Shah" (شاه بزرگ).

May the rule of the Kaisarin be more durable than that of the great Moslem conqueror!

POSTSCRIPT.

Since these pages were in type, some information has been communicated to me by Dr. Birch, of the British Museum, relating to the use of some of the imperial titles of Rome in Egypt, which are interesting in themselves, and oblige me to correct some of my remarks relating to the use of the titles, *dominus* and *δεσπότης*. I have assumed that they were interchangeable. It appears, however, that in the early Empire, *κύριος* was the usual equivalent of *dominus*. Eckhel, (*Doctrin. numor. veterum*), in tracing the history of these titles, carries them no further back, on coins, than the time of Antoninus Pius, when it appears on a coin struck at

Antioch, with the inscription ΑΥΤΟΚΡ. ΚΥΡ. ΑΝΤΩΝΕΙΝΟΣ. The same title afterwards appears on coins of M. Aurelius, struck in Mesopotamia, inscribed ΠΙΕΡ ΝΙΚΗΣ ΤΩΝ ΣΕΒΑΣΤΩΝ. Some other instances are given, confined to the Eastern provinces, and lastly, on coins of Gallienus struck at Alexandria. That it was commonly applied to the Emperor, in the East, appears from the expression of Festus regarding Paul, "of whom I have no certain thing to write to my lord," (τῷ κύριῳ). The title was superseded, as applied to the Emperor, by that of *δεσπότης*, owing, I suppose, to the former being the customary appellation of our Saviour; but it held its ground in certain public acts, and Selden mentions that it is applied to the Emperors in the imperial constitutions of Constantinople. In its corrupted forms, *κῦρ* and *κῦρις*, it occurs frequently. The title *primicerius*, used by the Saxon Kings of England, is derived from this source. A Frank Duke of Athens bore the title, (*Πριμμικήριος*), which is explained by Nicephorus Gregoras, as quoted by Ducange, *μέγας ἐλέγετο κύριος*.

Dr. Birch writes to me: "At Elephantine a number of potsherds have been found, officially dated in the reigns of the Roman Emperors, from Caligula to Septimius Severus. Caligula is called *καῖσαρ* only, without any other title. Nero, Vespasian, and Domitian are called *κύριος*, always accompanied by the article, as *ὁ κύριος*. Trajan used *ἄριστος* in addition to *κύριος*, and Domitian sometimes uses *καῖσαρ ὁ κύριος*, which is continued by his successors. This is the official title till the time of Septimius Severus, when the title *αὐτοκράτωρ* was first used by the tax-gatherers. This title was, however, placed on the imperial coins as early as Claudius at least."

In a subsequent memorandum, he adds, "The word *δεσπότης* does not appear in any official title till very late, long after the third century; but Hermapion translates (Ammian. Marcell. xvii. 4) one of the titles of Rameses on the obelisk by *δεσπότης διαδήματος*, the equivalent apparently of *κύριος βασιλευῶν*, which Ptolemy V. has on the Rosetta stone, an old Egyptian appellation prefixed to royal names, but never

used in the Demotic contracts and law-deeds of the period (Letronne, *Inscriptions Grecques de Rosette*, Paris, 1841, pp. 1, 7).

“The Egyptian form Autocrator occurs on the hieroglyphic monuments of Egypt as early as Augustus (Lepsius, *Königsbuch*, Taf. lxi. 729, D.), and is continued till Decius, (Ibid. lxvii. 753, D.); after which it is uncertain if any royal name is known. There is the following reason for supposing that the word Autocrator meant ‘King of Kings.’ Horapollo says, Book I. lxi. that the Egyptians represent king by a serpent surrounding a large house. Now the large house is found inside a cartouche at the Roman period, and Horapollo in the place cited says that it designates a *κοσμοκράτωρ*, or ‘King who rules the world.’ At the Roman period it is first seen after the name of Xerxes, and appears to be the equivalent of the title ‘King of Kings,’ attributed by the Greeks to the Persians, but given in the Persian cuneiform as ‘Great King.’”
