CHAPTER 5

Imagining Iran before Nationalism: Geocultural Meanings of Land in Azar’s Atashkadeh

MANA KIA

Nationalist views of Iran are predicated on “a congruence of state, society and culture,” territorialized onto a homeland and sharply delineated from those around it. The scholarship of the last few years has detailed the various ways in which this process of imagining Iran as a national homeland occurred in the later nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. All agree that there were previous notions of a place called Iran, and ways of belonging to it, that were different from what came after. But the question remains, what were these notions? Without specific historicizing, concepts like Iran tend to be read according to modern understandings that are paradoxically predicated on timelessness, even as they argue for radical differences caused by modernity. For Firoozeh Kashani-Sabet, whose work specifically focuses on the importance of land, works of medieval geography describe regions “much like nation-states today.” Geographical notions of a large swath of land understood to be Greater Iran were, she argues, “a means of self-definition” shared by “other Iranians” in medieval times. Such a reading creates a premodern period consisting of centuries of static homogeneity, posed in contrast to the radical changes of the modern period. Yet, strangely, a sense of being Iranian seems to have existed throughout nonetheless. Historical contingency is evacuated, obfuscating the important differences in the constitution and narration of geocultural borders of Iran at particular times. It is certainly important to trace continuities in “the long-standing patterns within societies to distinguish between rivals and neighbors by delineating territorial and cultural boundaries,” but not without questioning implicit nationalist assumptions as to the congruence of such boundaries.

Even scholarship not directly concerned with nationalism or the modern period is still bounded by nationalist assumptions about how the land of Iran was conceived of and what it meant to be from Iran within the broader
geocultural Persianate world. This article seeks to contribute to the question of continuity by outlining what I call geocultural meanings of land in a famous late eighteenth-century poetic tazkereh (commemorative compendium), the Atashkadeh of Lotf’Ali Bayg “Azar” Baigdeli (AD 1721-1781/AH 1134-1195). In the present study, I refer to Central Asia as Turan and South Asia as Hendustan and seek to historicize what is meant by Iran in the early modern context, because part of what enables anachronistic conceptual interpretations of the past is the use of anachronistic names. Even in a text like the Atashkadeh, where the land of Iran is central to the geograpical mapping of Persian literary culture, there are specific perceptions of land and culture, shared with other texts of this period, that distinguish it from modern nationalist concepts. Iran was distinct from, but contiguous in meaning with, the lands around it, and these meanings can initially lend themselves to (proto-) nationalist readings. One difference with nationalism lies in geocultural meanings, the ways in which significance is vested in land through a history of near and far figures and events contained in the corpus of Persianate learning. I use the term “Persians” to refer to a group of people who shared a particular language of learning. Knowledge of Persian was derived from a corpus of well-known texts, and gave rise to shared literary tropes, interpretive paradigms, and representational forms. Persians in Iran, Turan, and Hendustan shared particular understandings of the meaning of geography, and how these meanings constituted bases of origin and community.

The Atashkadeh as a Tazkereh

The Atashkadeh is a tazkereh, a commemorative compendium of poets, a rich yet often overlooked genre of source material (beyond literary studies) for eighteenth-century social and cultural history. Understanding tazkerehs as commemorative compendiums instead of biographical dictionaries can show us something about the cultural and social contexts of their authors in a way that is less dependent on, but still mindful of, the value of the factual content of the entries. Tazkereh authors, as poets themselves, include and represent certain past and present poets as part of an imagined community, a cultural community of ancestors and peers, that transcended shared origins or homelands as they were conceived of in the eighteenth century. This cultural community transcended actual acquaintance, political loyalties, social ties (such as those between teacher and student), and ethnic commonalities (genealogical or broader tribal groupings) to create linkages based on poetic sensibilities, which defined the tazkereh author himself. These authors had gone through "a process of moral and intellectual education designed to produce an adil, a gentleman-scholar," and thus the constitution of tazkerehs as books of ancestors and peers, was "intimately connected with the formation of both intellect and character." Knowledge of poetry and the ability to compose it was one basic feature of this community of peers, who were often well versed in—or even best known for—other things, such as medicine, religious sciences, accounting, political administration, military leadership, and even commerce. Commemoration of friends, contemporaries, and bygone poets created a field of representation in which the poetic self of the author came into being.

Contemporaneous understandings of tazkerehs in other types of texts support this understanding. In the early nineteenth century, Abd-al-Latif Shushtari, when describing his friend Abu Taleb Esfahani, mentioned that he had written a tazkereh "from which the amount of his learning and taste is evident (mezdar-e fahm va saliyeih-ash az an borowyat-a)." Abu Taleb's learning was evident in his ability to provide biographical information and poetry, but his refinement of taste, also, was demonstrated by his choice of poets and particular selections of their poetry. Shushtari understood the text as demonstrating something about Abu Taleb, indicating that the perception of tazkerehs as texts of self partly defined their consumption. Underpinning this expression of self is the possession of specific types of learning, shared by others in a larger Persianate cultural community.

Though it was common to include contemporaries whom the author had never met, the most substantive entries were usually about people with whom the author had a relationship or interaction, since reliability of information was perceived to be derived from personal acquaintance. It was through overt reference to, and specific representation of, the author's social community, political ties, and literary commitments in entries on other poets that the author's character was constructed. Understanding the way in which self-construction was a critical aspect of eighteenth-century Persian tazkerehs enables an appreciation of the ways in which social and political ties needed to be expressed in a particular text. Such an appreciation acknowledges the narrativity of the entries, why the author chose to leave out, or foreground, certain facts according to concerns that tell us about the possibilities of Persianate selfhood beyond inscrutable personal idiosyncrasies.

Unlike the tazkerehs of previous centuries, eighteenth-century tazkerehs were usually not created within the context of court patronage, and had substantial historical and autobiographical narratives that were novel to this genre. The Atashkadeh departs from other early modern tazkerehs in several ways. Most were organized alphabetically or by tahaye (station). In contrast, Azar's Atashkadeh maps poets according to origin, an imperfect terri-
torialization that is different from the all-encompassing meanings of territorial origins in modern nationalism. Geographical refiguring, particularly of one’s homeland, however it was conceived of, had always been a concern of the *tazkereh* genre, particularly in times of great upheaval. Azar was born in the year the Afghans invaded Iran, laid siege to Isfahan, bringing down the Safavid state and inaugurating a period of political instability only briefly interrupted by Nader Afshar’s seizure of the throne. Azar perceived himself as living in a ruined Iran, and the *Atashkadeh* places an overweening emphasis on Persians originating in the former Safavid dominions (mamalek) of Iran before Azar’s time. A small number of historical poets originating in Turan and Hindustan, as well as a separate category of women, are included at the back. Post-Timurid poets who traveled or migrated to Hindustan are included, but given relatively short shrift. The conclusion is a historically rooted autobiographical narrative that also includes sixty entries on Azar’s poetic contemporaries. Though Azar includes contemporaries who migrated to, or originated in, Hindustan, the most substantial of these entries are of those poets who were part of his circle of friends, as is the case with most *tazkerehs.*

Often read as “an early expression of literary nationalism in Iran,” linking Persian culture to the land of Iran by omitting large numbers of Persian poets originating in Central and South Asia, the *Atashkadeh* endeavors to do two things that must be distinguished from nationalist concerns. First, it seeks to memorialize a new style of poetics (only later called the *baqgashi*) by retuning the value of the *tazkereh* (often anachronistically called the “Indian Style,” or *sabk-e Hind*) of the preceding centuries. But in doing so, the *baqgashi* rejected many post-Timurids originating in the cities of Iran, as well as from Turan and Hindustan. Second, the text seeks to place Iran (specifically *Eraq-e Isfan*) at the center of poetic culture, since it is from there that the new style originated, at a time when Iran was perceived to be in a state of ruin in contrast to its glorified Safavid past. This impulse to recenter Persia in Iran must be understood in a context where the greatest centers of poetic patronage had been in Mughal domains, in the cities of Lahore and Delhi, for the past century and a half. Centers of patronage were also where poetic styles developed and from which they emanated. The *Atashkadeh* was written as an intervention in the style that was current at the time, placing Azar’s own Isfahani circle on the larger poetic map by linking it to the old masters originating in Safavid lands and attempting to shift the center of stylistic development back to Iran. The very means by which the *Atashkadeh* distinguished and centered Iran within the larger Persianate world depended on a history and standard of evaluation that was shared with other Persians in Turan and Hindustan. In the text, Iran is central to the Persianate world and foremost in it culturally, but not singular or unique, sharing many overlapping features with Turan and Hindustan. A person’s history, language, and community could not be reduced to their birth in the various cities of Iran. Furthermore, a person’s origin was also defined by tribe, lineage, or learning in a way that could supersede territorial origin.

**Geocultural Persianate Landscapes**

The Persianate world included lands where a body of knowledge—geographical, historical, religious, philosophical, and poetic—was dominant among the educated classes, mainly in Iran, Turan, and Hindustan. Ethical evaluations and paradigmatic possibilities were contained in this literary corpus. According to Kathryn Babayan, one prominent feature of the Persianate ethos was a sense of cyclical time and being, exemplified in the *Shahnameh,* where “Iranian society is portrayed as encountering similar ethical dilemmas in different ages. In each era, kings are confronted with analogous situations as they attempt to rule their dominion with justice and to deal with political realities and ethical choices regarding their sons, warriors, subjects and neighbors (Turan, Hind, Rum).” These paradigmatic stories, first told in the *Shahnameh* and more widely dispersed through other texts and genres, underpinned Persianate cultural understandings of ethics, history, and place.

In the context of the Mughal court, manuscripts of the *Shahnameh* were less often patronized. However, widely circulated universal histories contained stories of pre-Islamic Persian kings, alongside pre-Islamic Quranic history, and gave meaning to history and land within the Persianate world. This parallel dual narrative permeated Iran and Hindustani Persian texts up through the early nineteenth century, first through shared Timurid historiographical heritage, then, as it developed, in the closely related Mughal and Safavid historiographical traditions. The hugely influential Timurid universal history, *Rawzasat al-safa,* begins with pre-Islamicarkan creation up through the Flood, including the prophets, patriarchs, and kings of Israel, then continues at length with the history of pre-Islamic Persian kings up to the arrival of Islam. “The termination of both narratives signaled Islam’s moral and political superiority,” beginning with the birth of the Prophet Muhammad. The narrative of pre-Islamic Persian kings is a prose re-inscription of the epic poem the *Shahnameh.* After the fall of the Abbasids, the historical narrative of Muslim domains becomes increasingly focused on the Persianate Islamic East, and then entirely on Iran and Turan. This format of reconciled, parallel, pre-Islamic, Quranic, and Persian history in the *Rawzasat al-safa,* with
a post-Mongol emphasis on the Persianate East, became the template for Mughal and Safavid universal histories throughout the early modern period, however much their post-Timurid accounts might have differed. These universal histories circulated widely in the libraries of Hendustani and Irani Persians, Muslim and non-Muslim alike, well through the nineteenth century, as did the Shahnameh and its abridged prose narrative retellings. One of the last tazkerehs written in Iran that at least attempts to encompass lands beyond it, the Atashkadeh maps poets (excepting princes, nobles, women, and contemporaries) onto a geographically partitioned Persianate world that reflects both the accumulated dual narrative of Perso-Islamic histories and the specificity of Azar’s own time and location. A native of Isfahan and the Shamlu dynasty, his family fled to Qum for fourteen years after the Afghan invasion (1722), which occurred in the year of his birth. In 1736, Azar’s father was appointed governor of Lar and then Fars, bringing the family to Shiraz. After his father’s death in 1738, Azar accompanied his uncle on the Hajj, by way of the Shi’i shrine cities. He ended his pilgrimage in Mashhad, just as Nader Shah’s army was returning from Hendustan in 1741. Azar accompanied Nader’s army to Mazendaran, Azerbaijan and Erzurum, eventually settling in Isfahan. He spent the next years in service to various rulers of the city, frequently circles of the eloquent and learned, in particular naming his teacher Mir Sayyid Ali “Mousheqa.” When Ali Mardan Khan sacked Isfahan, Azar lost seven thousand verses of poetry and most of his library. “For a time after this crossroads (rahabez) the parrot of speech and the nightingale of my temperament were broken-winged, until with the solicitous care of friends (beh takallof-e abbah) sometimes they [the parrot and the nightingale] would engage in adorning the rose garden of thought.” In the years following his friend-assisted poetic recovery, he made enough of a name for himself that tazkerehs in Delhi took note of him. Azar later spent time in Shiraz, Karim Khan Zand’s capital, before retiring to Qum in the 1760s to take up poetry and write the Atashkadeh. He died in 1780. The geographically organized portion of the Atashkadeh is divided into the larger regions of Iran, Turan, and Hendustan. These regions are further subdivided into smaller regional domains, and then into cities. Azar begins with the larger region (velayet) of Iran, whose “distinctly temperate climate and the intellect/perception (adbak) of the inhabitants of that region (deyay) it is not necessary to make manifest,” because “all the books of histories speak to this point.” Significantly, it is to a presumably common body of historical texts that Azar points to justify his contention about the nature of the land’s climate and its inhabitants. These descriptions of larger regions are brief; the smaller domains, Azerbaijan, Khorasan, Tabarestan, Erzurum and Erzurum, and Fars listed under Iran, are described more substantially. Beginning with Azerbaijan, Azar contemplates the origin of the land’s name, its history, and the characteristics of its climate and people. The terms tazkereh and deyay refer to Azerbaijan as well as Iran, acting here as a synonym for mamlakat, demonstrating the fluid ways in which smaller and larger domains are referred to in context by the same word. The name Azerbaijan “is derived from (mansub hab) Azar ibn Amir ibn Asud ibn Sam, who was the son of Nuh [Noah]. Some have written that in the time of Shapur, Azar was the name of a person who claimed to be a prophet and seduced a great number of people into accepting his claim. Shapur seized him and melted metals (felezat) on his chest and he was not injured, causing the belief of people to grow. The flourishing of that region is due to him.” The qualification “some have written” precedes the pre-Islamic Persian narrative from the Rawuzat al-safa, unlike the Quranic narrative, which demanded acceptance as absolute truth. Following the Rawuzat al-safa, Azar prefaces his inclusion of such popular stories with disclaimers of their veracity, but includes them because of their wide currency. His description of Mazandaran begins with its near past, of Shah Abbas, who, on account of his mother’s family origin, spent much time there, building gardens and palaces. In providing its geographical details, Azar taps into a far, possibly mythical, past, explaining that one of its impregnable fortresses was a place where

[...] during the time of Afrasiab’s conquest and the defeat of the Iranians, Manuchehr was besieged. Afrasiab was not victorious in his conquest of the fort. In the end, the great ones of Iran and Turan agreed on this condition for peace, that from the aforementioned fort an arrow should be launched and wherever it hit the ground should be the division of the holdings of Afrasiab and Manuchehr. Arash, one of the great warriors (pahlavan) of Iran, launched an arrow that, after examination, had struck the ground on the banks of the Jazayer (Oxus) river. However much the acceptance of this story is outside the pale of probability, it has been written on account of its great fame (shobn). These pre-Islamic Persian geographical lineages are viewed with a degree of skepticism, such as the account according to which an arrow could fly from Mazandaran to the Oxus. Yet such accounts are still included in the descriptions of geographical regions, because their fame had come to partially convey the character and meaning of these places.
The context of Azar’s composition was the ruin of Iran, a perception that undergirds the Asrārkhāneh as a whole and is an essential part of the rhetorical labor of the text. Khorasan, “a province consisting of old and great cities, is the great cornerstone (robn) of the region of Iran. At this time, like the rest of Iran, it is ruined.” More specifically, in describing places such as Kerman and Sabzevar, Azar elaborates that cities and their populations have been much reduced by “the vicissitudes of the times (engelab-e zamanèh).” Azar and many other authors writing in the middle decades of the eighteenth century repeatedly reiterated this perception of the many regions of Iran being ruined, though they differed on its causes. Different views on specific events were, nonetheless, bound up in the shared understanding of the meaning of lands where Iran and Hindustan had contrasting relationships to sacred space and cultural knowledge. Place of origin, direction of travel, and the reason for writing structure meaning within these travel texts.

Though political fragmentation, colonial encroachment, and a decided Iranianization of the Persian language was occurring in both Hindustan and Iran by the nineteenth century, a Hindustani Persian could still narrate places according to this dual Islamic and pre-Islamic Persian narrative. Ali Mirza Mafτun, a traveler from Patna through Iran in the early nineteenth century (1826–1828), maps the geographical meaning of Tehran beginning with the older, nearby town of Rayy, figured as Tehran’s ancestor.

It is revealed to those versed in histories that the land of Rayy is in the fourth cline and one of the great old cities of [the province of] ‘Eraq-e ‘ajam and there are differing accounts of its building. Some give the credit of its founding to Hushang, some to the prophet Seth, son of Adam. Regarding the flourishing and habitation and spaciousness of it [Rayy] they [the histories] tell stories which are not empty of strangeness (gohorèt). For those who depend on proof (abī-e khebrat) it is manifest that the aforementioned land has been wrecked and ruined several times by massacre and pillage and earthquake.

The most spectacular instances of ruination, he notes, were at the hands of Genghis Khan. Mafτun demonstrates his knowledge of the dual narrative, though he also expresses skepticism about the veracity of both the pre-Islamic Qur’anic and Persian distant past. The only history he can be sure of, which has left material evidence and contemporaneous histories, is the more recent history of Rayy’s destruction centuries ago at the hands of invaders like Genghis Khan. But, regardless of relative perceptions of reliability, the less reliable distant past still widely marks the geocultural meaning of place.

Art historians have noted that Mughal manuscript traditions included representations of architecture in both image and text, as a way to lend character to a place and commemorate the achievements of rulers. Later paintings presented architectural monuments as the sole subject in more technical and clearly articulated detail, reminiscent of actual architectural plans drawn for functional purposes. These new types of paintings, inserted in Mughal texts re-commissioned in manuscript form in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, represented architecture as a more integral sign of the achievements of certain rulers. This connection is echoed in Mafτun’s descriptions of architecture, its patron/ruler, and their links to the history of the city. After mapping out the different gates of Shiraz, Mafτun notes that “in the direction of the western gate there are great structures, exalted palaces without blemish, and gardens pleasing to the heart and without compare and the like, which are the constructions of Mohammad Karim Khan Zand, known as Vakīl, who at one time was the ruler (farmanfar‘a‘) of the domains of Iran.” Shiraz had been the seat of Karim Khan’s rule and contemplation of that rule included a careful cataloging of his architectural achievements, both of which Mafτun wholeheartedly approved. Mafτun describes Karim Khan as “protective of peasants, attending to the comforts of soldiers, the spreader of justice, a guide for manliness/humanity (morowwat), lord of the sword, politically astute,” and so much more along these lines that he hardly seems unworthy of taking the throne, a paradox of humility that is precisely the point. Immediately following this, Mafτun, as if to underscore these qualities, notes that “his mind inclined greatly to building,” and what follows is a detailed description of these structures mapped onto the city of Shiraz.* Such connections between rulers and their structures are not limited to Karim Khan, as Mafτun limns Isfahan with structures built by the Safavid shahs, Tehran as built by Fath ‘Ali Shah, and Mashhad as built by centuries of rulers, particularly the Afsharids. Architecture mapped onto urban space as a sign of political order serves as a vehicle through which Mafτun narrates places, as the accumulation of their histories.

The importance of a ruler’s architectural contributions to the formation of the character and identity of place is not limited to Indo-Persian contexts. Though only briefly part of Safavid domains, the Asrārkhāneh’s short section on ‘Eraq-e ‘arab is included under the larger region of Iran. Azar notes that Baghdad was founded in the year 763/146, close to a garden built at the time of the Persian kings near the palace of Ctesiphon. Thus, the seat of the Caliphate is mapped onto a site defined by the power of pre-Islamic Persian kings. The next mention of architectural contribution is not of Abbāsids but of the Ilkhanids, and then Shah ‘Abbas Safavid, “who built new fortifications around
the city after conquering it." This last serves to undergird the region's link to Iran by noting the role of the kings of Iran in the very physical structure of the city.

Though geographically distinct from Iran, Turan is part of the Islamic and Persianate heartlands through its shared pre-Islamic Persian history. Azar notes that "when Faraidun ruled, he divided up the domains of his empire during his life. He gave [the land] from the banks of the Jahan [Oxus] to Tur, which became known as Turan. He entrusted the region of Rum [one manuscript says Hend] to Salm. He gave the domain of Iran to Iraq, who gave his name to Iran. In the end, what happened came to happen and it is fully detailed in [the aforementioned] histories." This story originally appears in the Shabnameh and subsequent universal Persianate histories as Faraidun's division of the world. The genealogy of these lands, as once united and then ruled by brothers, however bitterly they may have fought, creates a picture of related regions springing from one origin. The conflict that ensues between the brothers is caused by envy of Iraqi's lot, since the throne of Iran is the coveted, choice portion. The land of Iran is connected to, but set hierarchically above, neighboring lands, as the original seat of rule. The resulting envy-fueled aggression on the part of Iraq's brothers and their descendants serves to set them, and thus their lands, ethnically lower than Iran. Though sharing common origins with Iran, the relation is one of conflict, where Iran has the higher moral status, due to the more noble behavior of its rulers.

Azar's inscription of pre-Islamic Persian history onto Turan extends to smaller regional and city descriptions. The Atashkadeh describes Farghana as the farthest region of Turan, "at the corner of the civilized world (dar kenar-e ma'mur-e 'islam)." Azar has mentioned other lands, such as Europe (farangi) and Syria (sham), demonstrating that the term ma'mur does not refer to the known world, but the civilized/Persianate world. This specifically Persianate refinement of civilization does not exclude the possibility of civilization in other places, like the Hijaz, which possesses the sacralized history of Islamic refinement. But though the holiest site of Islam, it does not possess Persianate poetic culture and the history in which Iran is the center, a history particularly prominent at a time when Azar was self-conscious of a less exalted present. The inclusion of Hend, even in the reproduction of only some manuscripts of the Atashkadeh in the tripartite division of the Persianate world reflects the legibility of Persianized Mughal Hindustan and the decreasing Persianization of Ottoman Rum by the eighteenth century, an updated geocultural mapping of the fifteenth century of Rawuzat al-safa.

This occasional inclusion is precarious, though not reflected in descriptions of the larger land of Hindustan.

In the Atashkadeh, Hindustan is outside of pre-Islamic Quranic and Persian history. Azar describes Hindustan as a place where "the customs and etiquettes [...] are for the most part in conflict/opposition with [those of] the inhabitants of Iran and even Turan (resum va qavaz-e an ja aksar khelaf-e akl-e Iran ast balke Turan)." This opposition between the customs defining the societies of the two lands is further underlined by the strangeness of the land itself. "The strange fruits of that place cannot be found in this region [Iran]." Yet, individual descriptions of these smaller regions and cities are far more equivocal with respect to their relation to Iran. Because of its verdant gardens, delightful plains, and the quality of its air and water, Azar describes Delhi as exceptional among the cities of Hindustan. Immediately following is the presumably pertinent history of Delhi, its conquest by Muslim rulers in 1192/588, from which time it was a center of Muslim rule by "dynasties of great nobility." Skipping ahead to the latest of these dynasties, Azar focuses on the architectural contribution of Shahjahan, who filled the gaps in the city's structures, ensuring the city would flourish, which is why it is called Shahjahanabad. "At this time, which is the year 1179 [1765-1766] that which had successively happened, caused by the arrival of Nader Shah Afshar and Ahmad Shah Afghan, has brought extreme disorder and ruin [to the city]."

For Azar, Iran was not the only land to have fallen into ruin. Hindustan had also been laid low by invaders and resulting chaos. By this time, many of the literati of Delhi had migrated to other cities, mainly regional centers of Faizabad, Hyderabad and Moresbad, and were generally in agreement with Azar's assessment.

In the Atashkadeh, both the people and land of regions of Hindustan are celebrated. Azar describes Lahore as "a famous city of Hindustan. Even though it is in an area with a warm climate, they say that in the summer snow and ice come to hand and it has good fruits. Its people are clever/shrewd (zirak)." This description of Lahore contrasts with the more negative description of the larger land of Hindustan. Even less equivocal, Azar's description of Kashmir is positively glowing, disrupting arguments that the Atashkadeh glorifies the land of Iran in contrast to, and to the exclusion of, others, particularly Hindustan.

From the abundance of gardens, trees, the multitude of rivers and streams, the whole city is a portion of the verdancy of heaven (jamam-e shahr geteb-i: ast az marghzar-e jannat). They say that its soil imparts great joy (jarab-
nai) and its air elicits delight (ezbat angix). During the reign of Sultan Sekandar the religion of Islam came to prevail. The weaving of shawls is the specialty of that region that they take to all parts of the world. That region yields a great deal of saffron.66

The physical character of the land itself is vaunted as heavenly, the very earth and climate inducing joy and delight. In the following section of Kashmir’s poets, Azar refers to Binish as “from that paradisiacal region (deyar-e khold asar).”69 Calling a land “paradisiacal” was generally a form of demonstrating affiliation, a way of declaring home.70 In some cases, within Persianate geocultural understandings, places like Kashmir were understood to be paradisiacal, whether or not an author had been there, and whether or not the place was within the larger land with which the author was affiliated. Azar also demonstrates familiarity with images of other beautiful green mountainous places to which he has never been, including Badakhshan and Qandahar.71

Geography gained meaning according to climes, where domains gained character in a symbiotic relationship between the inhabitants, government, land, and climate. Persianate regions were intertwined in the clime system, though climes did not correspond to larger regions.72 The middle clime of the seven, the most temperate and thus desirable fourth clime, was not limited to the domains of Iran, but also extends to the regions of Turan and Hendustan, such as Kashmir.73 Various domains of Iran were also in the warmer, less temperate third clime, such as parts of Khorasan, Erāq-e ʿarab, Fars and parts of Erāq-e ʿajam.74 Though entirely in the third clime, Fars was “the seat of most of Pishsadi and Keyan kings [pre-Islamic Persian dynasties]. They say that Persepolis (esṭakhr) is the first of Iran cities to have been built in the inhabited world (robāʾe maskun).”75 In spite of its venerable age and pre-Islamic Persianate history, this integral part of Iran is in the third clime, not the fourth. The northern reaches of Azerbaijan are in the colder fifth clime.76 The land of Iran is not contained in the central, most desirable fourth clime, which includes portions of other lands. Lands located in the same clime shared similar physical features that corresponded to moral character. These features problematize a reading of the Atashkadeh as a text in which the land of Iran is vaunted above all others, per modern nationalist notions that require narratives of radical difference and unique singularity of homeland.

The way the land was depicted geographically, what this meant about the moral constitution of the inhabitants, and how meaning was assigned to a place, are all indicative of a humorist understanding of connections between land and nature. “Water and air” was an expression used to refer to the means by which land could determine human or cultural disposition. Azar notes that the shoemaker/poet Aqaʿ Abūlḥab “Shaʿef” was from Qom, “but he had an extremely pleasant disposition,” a statement that points to a commonly held idea about the dispositions of Qomīs.77 This essence could be altered. The poet “Dānī” was the son of a Hamadani, “but he himself was born in Isfahan and [because] the temperate water and air of that paradisiacal region nourished the sapling of his body/form (qamāt), he knows himself as an Isfahānī.”78 Circulating features of the land, such as water and air, could interact with a person’s body and transform his nature. Less mutable than people, land nonetheless gained character according to its people, especially its rulers under whose stewardship the flows of people took place.

**Origin and Land**

Not everyone in Azar’s poetic community could be linked to a land, but everyone was born in a place. Azar describes them as “kings and princes of every land (bar deyar) and commanders of great power of every dominion (mamlakat), including Turks and others that in truth are not connected to a [particular] land (mansub beḥ-e teyārat nistand).”79 This territorialization section provides an alternative view of whom Azar considers part of the Persianate, figures whose ties to lands were multiple and not the basis of their origin. Lineage, tribe, position, and service define the individuals in this section. The kings and princes range from descendants of Soltan Mahmud to Seljuks, Safavids, and Timurids of Iran, Turan, and Hendustan.80 The most attention is given to the progenitors of the line, as in the lengthy description of the maternal and paternal genealogy of Shah Esma’īl Safavid. This shah is most important for who he was, rather than his poetry, most of which was written in Turkish.81 Azar also provides sizeable entries, mostly historical rather than poetical, for a number of his sons and descendants.82 This section lists numerous pre-Safavid rulers, such as Sultan Yāqūb, “the son of Hasan Padshah Torkaman [Aqqoyunlu]. [Judging by] that which has been gleaned from histories, there had never been such a king among the Turks (etreb).”83 This ethnicity is a known identity, which defines a specific dynasty, the Aqqoyunlu, who ruled northwestern Iran from Tabriz in the fifteenth century. Among the Timurid princes included are those, such as Homayun and Akbar, who ruled Hendustan. Azar describes Homayun as being “of the sons of Timur Gurkan. After Babor Padshah, he raised the flag of kingship in the domain of Hendustan.”84 The Gurkani rulers of Hendustan were largely defined as originating
from the Timurid royal line. At different times, these princes ruled various domains in Iran, Turan, and Hendustan. It is lineage that defines them, as no single place can.

Descriptions of high nobles (omara) focus less on fathers and more on generalized lineages of tribes and ethnically defined groups of people, in service to kings of Turan, Iran, and Hendustan. Azar describes the origin of the poet Bikhvodi not as a place, but as a lineage/tribe, the Rumlu (asab az ta‘efeh-ye Rumlu), and that he grew up (nasib va noma’ayeteh) in Farah. The poet Salim is identified as “from the Shamlu oymaq and a resident (saken) of Tehran and Qazvin.” For men from these Turkmen oymaq, collectively known as the Qizilbash, this tribal identity turned family lineage trumped geographical place as the primary factor of origin. Place merely functions to distinguish them further as individuals. They are residents of cities, sometimes more than one, but do not belong to them like other poets. Azar himself was a Shamlu, and while this heritage no longer meant the same thing as in the first century of Safavid rule in terms of language or military position, it had crystallized into an ethnic identity of origin. When this ethnic identity was taken beyond the borders of Iran, to which the Qizilbash were particular, it became a marker of the specificity of Iran within the larger Persianate world.

Belonging to multiple lands because of political loyalties were other figures, such as Bairy Khan Baharuthi, who was “of the oymaq of Bagdali Bahrulu’s Turcomans. From the beginning of Homayoun Shah’s reign, he renounced service to the Safavids (az davlat-e Safavi ru gordan shodeh) and went from Qandahar to Hendustan.” Bairy Khan’s move from Qandahar to Hendustan occurred in tandem with switching loyalties from one king to another, causing these lands to accrue as part of his identity. But his immutable origin is his Turcoman ethnicity and Bahrulu tribal identity, modified by his service to rulers of particular lands. The only sense of belonging to one land or another is his service to kings who rule particular kingdoms. Regardless of the reasons, the lack of centrality of place is the defining feature of origin in the section on kings, princes and high nobles. When included, place is multiple and accumulated in a narrative of origin determined by lineage and service, not a site of origin in and of itself.

For women, lack of fixity to a particular land at first seems to do with the mutability of their primary affiliations, as a daughter, wife, or mother, definitions created according to male relatives, who are themselves assumed to be more geographically fixed. The only information Azar provides for Nur Jahan Begum’s origin is that she was “the wife (baran) of Jahangir, the king of Hendustan.” Her two verses are prefaced with vague vignetted about them being improvised in the context of her interaction with Jahangir. But sons, like daughters, shared the same affiliation with prominent fathers. Nur Jahan is defined according to her husband, a king, not her father, who was less well known. Additionally, her known poetry was composed during her presence at court, a contextual affiliation that would have been mentioned for a male poet as well. Women are thus not alone in being defined by other men, though marriage is one association discussed only in their context. Details beyond links with other men, such as place of origin and other activities in their lives, are included in the biographical information, when available. Mahsati’s entry is the longest provided for a woman, and fairly substantial in the Atashkadeh, regardless of sex. The only male mentioned in her biography is the Soltan at whose court she enjoyed prominence and patronage. The way in which Soltan Sanjar is narrated in her biography serves to historicize and specify her position, much as it would for any man. Azar’s description of Mahsati as noble-born from Ganjeh is a marker of origin that could easily be given to any male poet. But unlike a male poet, she is not listed under Azerbaijan’s poets. Instead of a poet of Ganjeh, Mahsati is a woman poet, who happens to be from Ganjeh. For Azar, it is her womanhood, not her location, that is a defining feature of her origin.

Women poets were a particularity, different from the general category of poets who are presumed to be male. This difference is transmitted to Azar in the form of the loss of, and lack of preservation of, women’s work, as well as the scanty biographical information available about them. Azar in turn reproduces this particularity in the organizational structure of the Atashkadeh. The poet A‘esha “is from the people of Samarqand (az abl-e Samarqand).” This is the only biographical specific Azar is able to provide, except for what he extrapolates from her poetry, “that her words are sweeter than sugar.” Instead of his personal selection, her poetry consists of what remains and he remarks, “though [no] verses besides these two ruha‘i have reached my consideration, it can be comprehended that she had a pleasant (khosh) disposition.” It is not that her work has merely failed to circulate, but that “copies of her thoughts have disappeared from among [us].” Even the work of the well-known Mahsati “was lost over time, especially in Abdullah Khan Uzbeg’s conquest of Herat.”

Paucity of poetry and biographical source material haunts the Atashkadeh as a whole, but overwhelmingly in this section.

Even if the geographical origin of some women is known, their gender, the meaning of their female sex, trumps that location as a definitive source of origin. They are defined by their particularity as women. Azar titles their section “an account of the circumstances [of the lives] and poetry of virtuous women linked to every land who lived in different times and whose words robbed all [others] of eloquence.” That this eloquence is in reference to other women
poets only is clear when Azar comments that Mahsati “of all the types (asnaq) of women, no one with such an exquisite (degqat) disposition has been seen.” Women are compared to each other, cordoned off from male poets into their own category, irrespective of different stations and affiliations or geographical and genealogical origins.

This gendered particularity is also constituted by the language and selection of detail of the biographical entries themselves. Though her biographical description and length of poetic selections make her entry like a man’s, Mahsati is still only a woman. Azar explains that her name is a compound contraction of mab (moon) and seti (the name by which female sayyids were called). Crafted onto her genealogy, her gender is modified into a particularity. In another sizeable entry, Azar remarks that Laileh Khatun “pursued rulership in a manly/capable (mardaneh) way and ruled the region of Kerman for a time.” There is no specific male according to whom her biography gains distinction, but the gendering of the ideals of bravery and strong leadership equate her with masculinity in general, both literarily and figuratively. In order to praise her, Azar evokes this abstracted male presence, in contrast to its presumed contemptible opposite, a presence according to which she is defined as an exception. Women are marked as flowers (Laileh) or noted for appropriate qualities, such as chastity (“Esmati”). Set apart from all other poets, who are men distinguished by their place of origin, rank, or their temporal proximity to Azar, it is these social specificities of their sex that become most important and that turn female poetry writers into the single category of women poets.

Conclusion

Even in a text such as the Atashkadeh, which seeks to map poets onto geography, place has a secondary role as a marker of origin for some people. Outside of such textual labors, a person’s alignment with lands was multiple, a multiplicity Azar was able to strip away for most past poets, reducing them to their place of birth, but not when it came to princes and nobles, women, and his contemporaries in the three lands. In order to valorize Iran in that mapping, Azar relies on the overlapping schematics of history and geographical characteristics specific to a still intermeshed social, political, and cultural Persianate landscape. Even many of the poets whom Azar maps onto Iranian cities spent most of their lives elsewhere, as integral parts of Turan and Hindustani so cultural circles. In the eighteenth century, Azar’s valorization of Iran was unable to separate its society, culture and geography from neighboring Persianate lands. It is only within this shared Persianate geocultural context that

Iran as a land could be distinguished, distinctions that defied the exclusivity of nationalism.
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CHAPTER 6

The Khuzistani Arab Movement, 1941–1946: A Case of Nationalism?

BRIAN MANN

Many historians have focused on the complex and intriguing Kurdish and Azeri national movements of the 1940s, but the Khuzistani Arabs are conspicuously absent from the historiography of Iran’s “decentralization” era, which lasted from 1941 until 1953. When Iranian Arabs appear, they are often dismissed as nothing more than self-serving agents of British imperialism, or proxies for the British military, the Foreign Office, the Government of British India, or the Anglo-Iranian Oil Company (AIIOC). This paper challenges these views and conceptions, arguing that the elites of Khuzistani Arab society voiced a unique Arab ethnic national identity, which became the basis for a burgeoning yet short-lived ethnonationalist movement. To say otherwise, one would have to put aside the fact that the Arabs involved said they constituted a nation, a nation based on a shared ethnic identity rooted in shared traditions, rituals, and history, and one located within a defined territorial homeland. This does not discount that British agents, at times, lent support to the movement, but as this paper will demonstrate, often the British acted against Khuzistani Arab interests. Scholars have long recognized Soviet support for the Tudeh Party, the Mahabad Republic, and the Azerbaijan People’s Government, but simultaneously stress these movements as genuine and independent. This paper aims to provide the Arabs of Khuzistan the same treatment that has been afforded to other non-Persian ethnic movements and non-state actors.

Background

The Arabs of Khuzistan had long resented the modernization, centralization, and detribalization efforts of the Pahlavi state, and its ethnically Persian-