Besides his legal acumen, he was well versed in Avestan, Pahlavi, and Persian, having studied these subjects at the Sir Jamshedji Jijibhoy Zarthoshti Madrasa while he was a law student. He was a zealous worker in the field of Iranian literature, translating the poems of Saʿdi and Ḥāfeẓ. With his great love for Iran, he had the opportunity to visit the country in 1932 in the company of the poet-philosopher Rabindranath Tagore, when he was invited by Reza Shah Pahlavi. Recognizing his merits as a scholar of repute and a devoted friend of Persia, the shah conferred on him the Medal of Sciences (*nešān-e ʿelmi*) of the First Order. The last three or four years of his life form a tragic period with ill-health stalking his steps and loosening his hold upon his various activities. His declining health compelled him to decline courteously the second invitation to visit Persia extended by Reza Shah in 1934 in order to participate in the millenary celebration (*jašn-e hazāra*) of Ferdowsi (q.v.). He had a fairly short life but it was useful, rich, and beneficial to his community. His patronage of the Persian scholar Ebrāhim Pur(-e) Dāwud (see HISTORIOGRAPHY ix) during the latter's sojourn in India and his effort to have the latter's translations of Avestan texts printed in India are fondly acknowledged by him in several of his works (e.g., 1928, I, pp. 11-12; idem, 1952, pp. *vāv-za*, *ka*).

Bibliography: Works. *Gems from the Divine Songs of Zoroaster*, Bombay, 1922. *The Divine Songs of Zarathustra*, New York, 1924. *Poets of the Pahlavi Regime*, Pastonji D. Patel Memorial Iranian Series 4, Bombay, 1933. *Parov-i az falsafa-ye Irān-e bāstān*, Bombay, 1933. *Aḵlāq-e Irān-e bāstān*, Bombay, 1933. Ed. and tr., *Montaḵabāt-i az divān-e Abu'l-Qāsem ʿĀref Qazvini/Poems of Aref*, Bombay, 1933. *The Path to Happiness: The Ethical Teachings of Zoroaster*, Bombay, 1934. *Meaning of Masonry and the Meaning of the Persian Master* and *Our Beautiful Navjote Ceremony*, Bombay, 1939. *Understanding the Gathas. The Hymns of Zarathustra: Introductory Lectures on Gathic Themes*, ed. Kaikhosrov D. Irani, Womelsdorf, Penn., 1994. Irani also translated Pur(-e) Dāwud's introductions to his Persian translations of the *Yašt*s and the *Gatha*s and also published with English translation Ebrāhim Pur(-e) Dāwud's own poetry, *Purāndoḵt-nāma*, Bombay, 1927.

Studies. In 1943 Iranian, European Iranis, and Parsi friends dedicated a collection of essays on Iranian studies to his memory: see the introduction to *Dinshah Irani Memorial Volume: Papers on Zoroastrian and Iranian Subjects*, Bombay, 1943. Ebrāhim Pur(-e) Dāwud, ed. and tr., *Yašthā*, 2 vols., Bombay, 1928. Idem, tr., *Gāthā* I, Bombay, 1952. Idem, "Dinšāh Irāni," *Iran League Quarterly* 9, 1959, pp. 1-6. "Šād-ravān Dinšāh Irāni," *Andiša-ye mā* 1/5, 1946, pp. 4-6.

(KAIKHUSROO M. JAMASP ASA)

IRANIAN IDENTITY, a collective feeling by Iranian peoples of belonging to the historic lands of Iran. This sense of identity, defined both historically and territorially, evolved from a common historical experience and cultural tradition among the peoples who lived in *Irānzamin*, and shared in Iranian mythologies and legends as well as in its history (see IRAN iii. TRADITIONAL HISTORY). It was further defined and made distinctive by drawing boundaries between Iranians (the in-group) and the 'others' (out-groups), e.g., Iran vs. Anērān (q.v.; Sasanid notion), Iran vs. Turān (mythical and historical notion, later the lands of Turkic people), Iran vs. Rum (mythical and factual notions applied to Greece, Rome, Byzantium, and Ottoman empires), ʿAjam (primarily Persian) vs. Arab, Tājik/Tāzik (Persian) vs. Turk, Iran vs. Hend (India, particularly during the Safavid period), and Iran vs. Farang (i.e., Europe). This mode of identity was elaborated, transmitted, and continuously reconstructed by Iranian literati.

In Iran, similar to other societies, kinship and tribal bounds, ethnic and linguistic affiliations, religious and cultural affinities, local and provincial ties, and other communal allegiances have often competed with an overarching Iranian identity. Yet, a deep feeling of pride in Iran's cultural heritage with Persian literature as its core element, and a consciousness of continuity in a long and distinctive history of the country—particularly, a belief in the ability of the Iranian peoples to survive recurrent periods of upheavals—have served as a cohesive force to resist and ultimately overcome divisive currents.

Since the long and eventful history of Iran has seen recurrent constructions, transformations, and resurgences of Iranian identity—interpreted on the basis of a number of contentious notions of ethnic and national identities—a brief conceptual treatment of perspectives on Iranian identity is in order. Iranian identity will, therefore, be treated under the following five separate entries:

i. *Perspectives on Iranian identity*.
ii. *Pre-Islamic period*.
iii. *Medieval Islamic period*.
iv. *In the 19th and 20th centuries*.
v. *In the post-revolutionary era*. See Supplement online.

i. PERSPECTIVES ON IRANIAN IDENTITY

Perspectives on Iranian identity have been influenced by competing views on the origins of nations. Three main perspectives, as ideal types or pure types, may be distinguished as answers to the question, "what are the origins of nations?" The first perspective reflects the romantic nationalist view that nations are natural and essential elements in history since time 'immemorial.' The second perspective, which may be described as modernist or post-modernist, rejects the romantic, primordial idea of the origins of nations and views the concept of 'nation' as a modern construct. The third, which may be called the historicizing perspective, recognizes that "civic nation" is the product of modernity and as such could not be applied retrospectively to pre-modern times, but it strongly rejects the modernist and post-modernist contention of a radical discontinuity between a modern nation and its historical past. These different perspectives have influenced, to

varying degrees, the Iranists' scholarship on the origins of Iranian nationhood and Iranian national identity. The same perspectives have also influenced the perceptions of the ruling elites and political groups in 20th-century Iran.

Since the 19th century the construction of the modern concepts of Iran and Iranian identity have been particularly influenced by the romantic, nationalist perspective. It evolved with the help of a colorful repertoire of Iranian mythological and legendary traditions as well as Iran's factual history. Various forms of this perspective first emerged in the mid-19th century, and the seed grew with the literature of the Constitutional Revolution (see CON-STITUTIONAL REVOLUTION i and iii; and iv, below), ultimately serving as the ideological foundation of the Pahlavi state and helping the development of a modern nation-state in Iran. The writings of both Western and Iranian scholars played an important part in the emergence of this perspective in the field of Iranian studies and served as an ideological springboard for Iranian nationalist groups (see iv, below).

Refuting the romantic, nationalist concept of "national identity," with its proclivity towards "retrospective nationalism," a group of social scientists and historians have relocated the origin of the discourse on nations from time immemorial to modern times, to no earlier than the 18th century. According to this perspective, nations are modern constructs that are either 'invented' or 'imagined.' They maintain that nations are artificial constructs or inventions that were deliberately engineered by the ruling classes (Hobsbawm, 1990, pp. 9-10; Idem and Ranger, 1983). It may be noted that Ehsan Yarshater (1971, 1983, 1984) had already described a similar arrangement and codification of tradition for Iran in his analysis of the arrangement of Iran's traditional history during the Sasanid era. Gherardo Gnoli (1989, p. 177), too, adopted Hobsbawm's idea of the "invention of tradition" in his survey of the formation of a Pre-modern national state in the Sasanid period. However, the historicizing position of Yarshater and Gnoli, as will be discussed further in the following entries, shows that a type of pre-modern ethno-national identity was present in Iran long before the invention of modern version of the concept in the 18th and 19th centuries (see ii, below).

Under the influence of the increasingly popular modernist approach, Bert Fragner also posits a radical disjuncture between modern Iranian national identity and its historical past. He contends that modern Iranian nationalism is a prime example of how unrelated aspects of "Persian hegemony," which prevailed in the medieval period, have been used to construct a modern national culture and identity. In explaining his ideas he has introduced a useful paradigm to show how Persian, as the first "lingua franca," spread in medieval Islamic civilization as a trans-regional means of communication. Inspired by Antonio Gramsci's theory of cultural "hegemony," the key element in Fragner's formulation is the "hegemony of Persian language" (Fragner, 1999, pp. 33-99). Hegemony is realized when governing classes maintain their dominance, not simply through the use of force, but also through consensus. They achieve this goal by exerting moral and intellectual leadership through a network of institutions, social relations, and ideas (Gramsci, 1971, pp. 129-30, 139-40, 172, 144, 186-90, 341). His useful paradigm, however, seems to conflate the role of Persian hegemony in the identity formation of non-Iranian Islamic regions with its role on the Iranian plateau. It was in the lands of Iran where Persian language was deeply rooted, where the New Persian developed, where Persian culture prevailed, where Persian literati, as a dominant ethnic core with historical consciousness, were present, and where they laid the foundation for recurrent construction of pre-modern Iranian identity until modern times. Fragner's universal paradigm, therefore, is applicable primarily to the Ottoman empire, Central Asia, Mughal empire, and South-East Asia, and not to the Iranian plateau and the realm of its political community. The land of Iran was distinctively identified as "Iran" or (Mid. Pers.) ērānšahr during the Sasanid period and, after a period of lapses and ups and downs during the early Islamic era, has again been identified by the same name since the 13th century (see iii, below).

Another popular, modernist approach views nations as "imagined communities," arguing that the idea of communion in communities beyond primary groups with face-to-face relations, such as villages or tribal clans or neighborhoods, lives only in the mind of their members (Anderson, 1983, 1991). The metaphorical idiom of "imagined communities" has attracted the attention of a number of Iranian writers in their treatment of the origins of Iranian identity. The metaphorical reach of the concept of imagined communities (as used by Benedict Anderson) "exceeds its historical grasp," and it has been applied to the Iranian case without any reference to the rest of Anderson's theory (1991, p. 12). Thus is ignored the role played by the administrative language as an important element in promoting "proto-national cohesion" in pre-modern dynastic realms (for a skewed application of Anderson's theory to Iranian national identity with selective references to some historical sources, see Vaziri, 1993; for a historicizing review of this work, see Matin Askari, 1995; see also Karimi-Hakkak). These modernist concepts of national identity are based on the ideal types of modern, civic-territorial experiences of nationhood of European societies. Pre-modern, non-Western nations do not fit seamlessly into this model. The idea of national identity in societies of Asia is often derived from fictive genealogical and territorial origins and vernacular culture and religion (Smith, 2004, pp. 132-34).

Rejecting the essentialist tenet of the romantic, primordial conception of national identity as well as the modernist and postmodernist contention of a radical historical disjuncture in the origins of nations, the historicizing perspective emphasizes the role of historical forces in the formation of modern nations. It focuses on the historical origins of ethno-cultural communities and postulates that modern nations and nationalisms are products of long-term, historical processes. The historicizing quality of the "nation" is sought in myths,

memories, values, and symbols. The proponents of the historicizing perspective see ethnic communities and nations as historical phenomena that are subject to "flux and change" (Smith, 1991, 2004; Duara, 1996). Among the Iranists who have favored different versions of the historicizing perspective, one may include Ehsan Yarshater, Gherardo Gnoli (1989 and ii, below), Ann Lambton, Alessandro Bausani, Roy Mottahedeh, David Morgan, Faridun Ādamiyat, Shahrokh Meskoob, Moḥammad Reżā Šafiʿi-Kadkani, and Mohamad Tavakoli-Targhi.

For Yarshater, the arrangement and codification of traditional history of Iran by the Sasanids and the "Persian presence" in the formative period of the Islamic civilization represent two intertwined historical processes that have helped shape the historicized characteristic of Iranian identity. The combined impact of these two processes provided the Iranian people with a distinct identity in the Islamic world (Yarshater, 1971, 1983, 1984, 1998; see also iii, below). Ann Lambton, too, seems to favor the historicizing perspective in rejecting the notion of a retrospective nationalism, while recognizing the existence of a "consciousness of a distinct identity . . . 'īrāniyat,' ('being a Persian')" in medieval Persia (Lambton, 1978, p. 786). According to Lambton, this identity, defined historically and geographically, was formed by a common historical experience and the sharing of a common cultural and literary medium. In his discussion of the historical antecedents to the nationalist ideology in Iran, Ādamiyat (1967, pp. 246-68), a prolific author of the intellectual history of modern Iran, shows a tendency towards the historicizing approach to Iranian identity, though with a romantic orientation. He contends that basic elements of modern nationalism, such as the idea of Iranian lands and peoples, a common language and culture, and above all national pride and common historical consciousness, were all present in Iran even before the emergence of nationalism in modern Europe. Yet he recognizes that a reaction to increasing Western domination in 19th-century Iran, new discoveries of the ancient history of the country by Western scholars, and the spread of emerging European nationalism in Asia following the French Revolution, all helped initiate the development of a modern national consciousness and a nationalistic ethos in Iran beginning in the latter half of the 19th century. Finally, a conscious adherent of the historicizing approach is Mottahedeh, who—in answering the question of "in what sense did the Iranians have a common agreement as to the ties which made them a people?"—suggests that the educated Iranians "saw themselves as a people joined by their shared tie to *Irān-zamin*." This collective feeling of the Iranians of the medieval period, he emphasizes, is hardly "a mirror image" of the early modern European nationalism (Mottahedeh, 1971, pp. 181-82).

Conceptions of Iranian identity in terms of an Irano-Islamic cultural heritage have also found advocates among scholars and religious intellectuals. While critical of the romantic perspective on Iranian identity, Alessandro Bausani recognized the significance of Iran's medieval heritage as a background to the formation of modern Iranian national identity. In the concluding chapter of his book *I Persiani* (Florence, 1962) and its revised version (Wiesbaden, 1975), Bausani contended that the foundation of Iranian culture should be relocated from a pre-Islamic Achaemenid image to the medieval Iranian Islamic culture (Bausani, 1975, p. 47). Ḥamid Aḥmadi (2005, pp. 23-45) contends that Iranian national identity has survived a functional blending of the legacy of the ancient political heritage of kingship, Persian language and literature, and Iranian religions, i.e., Zoroastrianism and Shʿism. Aḥmadi's view of Iranian religions as enduring pillars of Iranian identity may have been influenced by the ideas of Henry Corbin and Sayyed Hossein Nasr, who, by interpreting Islamic philosophy mainly along the lines of the Gnostic tenets of Shiʿism, believed that the latter has been deeply rooted in ancient Iranian religion (see Corbin, 1946 and 1964; Nasr, 1964 and 1968). This hybrid idea of grounding Iranian identity in Iranian Islamic culture has also found currency with the Iranian promoters of liberal Islam in the last few decades, including Ayatollah Mortażā Moṭahhari, Mehdi Bāzargān, ʿAli Šariʿati, and ʿAbd-al-Karim Soruš (see iv, below).

The main development of Iranian identity, from its literary foundation during the Sasanid era to the present time, may be divided into the following phases: the foundation phase of arranging a pre-modern ethno-national identity with a sense of ancient ethno-nationalism during the late Sasanid era; the dormant phase following the Arab conquest of Persia; the revival phase of Iranian cultural identity under the Iranian regional dynasties during the 9th-11th centuries; a complex phase of Iranian identity during the Saljuq era; the resurgence phase during the Mongol and Timurid periods; the formation of a hybrid Iranian-Shiʿite identity during the Safavid era; and, finally, the national phase of the formation of a modern Iranian "national identity" during the last two centuries. These phases will be discussed in the following three subentries. The current debates on Iranian identity since the 1979 revolution will be discussed in a supplementary entry online.

Bibliography: Faridun Ādamiyat, "Ideʾoloži-e nāsionālism" (Nationalist ideology), in *Andišahā-ye Mirzā Āqā Ḵān-e Kermāni*, Tehran, 1967, pp. 246-68. Idem, "Nāsionālism" (Nationalism) in *Andišahā-ye Mirzā Fatḥ-ʿAli Āḵundzāda*, Tehran, 1970, pp. 109-36. Hamid Ahmadi, "Unity within Diversity: Foundations and Dynamics of Iranian National Identity," in *Critique, Critical Middle East Studies* 14/1, Spring 2005, pp. 127-47. Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, London, 1983; 2nd ed., 1991. Ahmad Ashraf, "Boḥrān-e howiyat-e melli wa qawmi dar Irān," *Iran Nameh* 7/3, 1994, pp. 521-50. Idem, "The Crisis of National and Ethnic Identities in Contemporary Iran," *Iranian Studies* 26/1-2, 1993, pp. 159-64. Alessandro Bausani, *I Persiani*, Florence, 1962. Idem, "Muhammad or Darius? The Elements and Basis of Iranian Culture," in S. Vryonis Jr. ed. *Islam and Cultural Changes in the Middle Ages*, Wiesbaden, 1975, pp. 43-57. Henry

Corbin, *Les motifs zoroastriens dans la philosophie de Sohrawardi*, Tehran, 1946. Idem, *Histoire de la philosophie islamique*, 2 vols., Paris, 1964. Prasenjit Duara, "Historicizing National Identity, or Who Imagining What and When," in Geoff Eley and Ronald Grigor Suny, *Becoming National: A Reader*, New York, 1996, pp. 150-77. Bert Fragner, *Die "Persophonie" : Regionalität, Identität und Sprachkontakt in der Geschichte Asiens* (Persophonia—regionalism, identity, and language contacts in the history of Asia), Halle an der Saale, 1999. Gherardo Gnoli, *The Idea of Iran: An Essay on Its Origin*, Rome, 1989. Antonio Gramsci, *Selections from the Prison Notebooks of Antonio Gramsci*, ed. Q. Hoare and G. Nowell Smith, New York, 1971. Aḥmad Karimi-Ḥakkāk, "Nežād, maḏhab, zabān: Taʾammoli dar se engāra-ye qawmiyat dar Irān," (Race, religion, language: three conceptualization of collective identity in Iran), *Iran Nameh* 11/4, 1993, pp. 599-620.

Ann K. S. Lambton, "Ḳawmiyya iii: in Persia," in *EI*[2] IV, 1978, pp. 785-90. Afshin Matin Askari, review of M. Vaziri's book, in *Iranian Studies*, 28/3-4, 1995, pp. 260-63. Shahrokh Meskoob, *Iranian Nationality and the Persian Language*, tr. M. Hillmann, ed. J. Perry, Foreword and Interview with the Author by Ali Banuazizi, Washington, D.C., 1992. Roy P. Mottahedeh, "The Shuʿubiyah Controversy and the Social History of Early Islamic Iran," *IJMES* 7/2, 1976, pp. 161-82. Seyyed Hossein Nasr, *An Introduction to Islamic Cosmological Doctrines*, Cambridge, Mass, 1964. Idem, *Science and Civilization in Islam*, Cambridge, Mass, 1968. M.-R. Šafiʿi Kadkani, "Talaqqi-e qodamā az waṭan," *Alefbā* 2, 1973, pp. 1-26. A. Shapur Shahbazi, "The History of the Idea of Iran," in Vesta Sarkhosh Curtis and Sarah Stewart, eds., *Birth of the Persian Empire*, London and New York, 2005, pp. 100-111. Anthony D. Smith, *National Identity*, London, 1991. Idem, *The Antiquity of Nations*, Cambridge, 2004. Mohamad Tavakoli-Targhi, *Refashioning Iran: Orientalism, Occidentalism and Historiography*, New York, 2001. Mostafa Vaziri, *Iran as Imagined Nation*, *The Construction of National Identity*, New York, 1993. Ehsan Yarshater, "Were the Sasanids Heirs to the Achaemenids?" in *La Persia nel Medioevo*, Rome, 1971, pp. 517-31. Idem, "Iranian National History," in *Camb. Hist. Iran* III/1, 1983, pp. 359-477. Idem, "Čerā dar *Šāh-nāma* az pādšāhān-e Mād wa Hakāmaneši ḏekri nist?" (Why are the Median and Achaemenian Kings not mentioned in the *Šāh-nāma*?), *Irān-nāma* 3/2, 1984, pp. 191-213. Idem, "The Persian Presence in Islamic World," in R. Hovannesian and G. Sabagh, eds., *The Persian Presence in Islamic World*, Cambridge, 1998, pp. 4-125.

(AHMAD ASHRAF)

ii. Pre-Islamic Period

The idea of Iran as a religious, cultural, and ethnic reality goes back as far as the end of the 6th century B.C.E. As a political idea, we first catch sight of it in the twenties of the 3rd century C.E. as an essential feature of Sasanian propaganda (Gnoli, 1989; 1993; 1998), since it does not seem possible to trace it back any further than the reign of Ardašīr (see ARDAŠĪR i). In actual fact we cannot say that the political idea of an **ariyānām xšaθra-* had ever existed before the advent of the Sasanian dynasty, though this claim has been made on several occasions (von Gutschmid, p. 123; Markwart, 1895, p. 629; Herzfeld, 1932, pp. 36-37; 1935, p. 9; 1941, p. 192; 1947, p. 700; and recently, Shahbazi, 2005, p. 105).

The inscriptions of Darius I (see DARIUS iii) and Xerxes, in which the different provinces of the empire are listed, make it clear that, between the end of the 6th century and the middle of the 5th century B.C.E., the Persians were already aware of belonging to the *ariya* "Iranian" nation (see ARYA and ARYANS). Darius and Xerxes boast of belonging to a stock which they call "Iranian": they proclaim themselves "Iranian" and "of Iranian stock," *ariya* and *ariya čiça* respectively, in inscriptions in which the Iranian countries come first in a list that is arranged in a new hierarchical and ethno-geographical order, compared for instance with the list of countries in Darius's inscription at Behistun (see BISOTUN; Gnoli, 1989, pp. 22-23; 1994, pp. 153-54). We also know, thanks to this very same inscription, that Ahura Mazdā was considered the "god of the Iranians" in passages of the Elamite version corresponding to DB IV 60 and 62 in the Old Persian version, whose language was called "Iranian" or *ariya* (DB IV, 88-89). Then again, the Avesta clearly uses *airya* as an ethnic name (*Vd*. 1; *Yt*. 13.143-44, etc.), where it appears in expressions such as *airyå daiŋhāvō* "Iranian lands, peoples," *airyō.šayanəm* "land inhabited by Iranians," and *airyanəm vaējō vaŋhuyå dāityayå* "Iranian stretch of the good Dāityā," the river Oxus, the modern Āmū Daryā (q.v.; see ĒRĀN-WĒZ). There can be no doubt about the ethnic value of Old Iran. *arya* (Benveniste, 1969, I, pp. 369 f.; Szemerényi; Kellens).

The Old Persian and Avestan evidence is confirmed by the Greek sources: Herodotus (7.62) mentions that the Medes once called themselves *Arioi*; Eratosthenes apud Strabo (15.2.8) speaks of Arianē as being between Persia and India; Eudemus of Rhodes apud Damascius (*Dubitationes et solutiones in Platonis Parmenidem* 125 bis) refers to "the Magi and all those of Iranian (*áreion*) lineage"; Diodorus Siculus (1.94.2) considers Zoroaster (*Zathraustēs*) as one of the *Arianoi*. The ethnic, linguistic, and religious import of terms connected with Old Pers. *ariya* and Av. *airya* is therefore borne out by a lot of different evidence, over a span of time that goes from the Achaemenid to the Seleucid and Parthian periods and in Iranian and non-Iranian sources. Besides Greek, the non-Iranian sources include Armenian, as in the expression *ari Aramazd* "Ahura Mazdā, the Iranian" in *The History of the Armenians* (sec. 127) by Agathangelos (de Lamberterie, p. 243; Schmitt, 1991; Gnoli, 1993, p. 19). An Iranian source, the Rabatak inscription (l. 3 f.) in the Bactrian language, has *ariao*, meaning "in Iranian (language)" (Sims-Williams, 1995-96, p. 83; 1997, p. 5; Gnoli, 2002). All this evidence shows that the name

arya "Iranian" was a collective definition, denoting peoples (Geiger, pp. 167 f.; Schmitt, 1978, p. 31) who were aware of belonging to the one ethnic stock, speaking a common language, and having a religious tradition that centered on the cult of Ahura Mazdā.

Although, up until the end of the Parthian period, Iranian identity had an ethnic, linguistic, and religious value, it did not yet have a political import. The idea of an "Iranian" empire or kingdom is a purely Sasanian one. It was the result of a convergence of interests between the new dynasty and the Zoroastrian clergy, as we can deduce from the available evidence. This convergence gave rise to the idea of an *Ērān-šahr* (see ĒRĀN, ĒRĀNŠAHR) "Kingdom of the Iranians," which was both *ēr* (Middle Pers. equivalent of Old Pers. *ariya* and Av. *airya*) and *mazdēsn* "Mazdean" (see ĒR, ĒR MAZDĒSN), as is evident from the formula *ēr māzdēsn* (Gnoli, 1987) placed before the name of Narseh, one of the sons of Šābuhr I, in the Kaʿbe-ye Zardošt inscription (ŠKZ, Mid. Pers. 24, Parth. 19, Greek 42-43) or before the name of Bahrām II on some of his coins (Lukonin, 1969, pp. 104, 177; 1979, pp. 39, 92 note 4, 116). Mid. Pers. *ēr* (plur. *ērān*), just like Old Pers. *ariya* and Av. *airya*, has an evident ethnic value, which is also present in the abstract term *ērīh*, "Iranian character, Iranianness" (Gnoli, 1986; 1989, pp. 147-48).

The singular and plural forms, *ēr* and *ērān*, in Middle Persian were widely used in the Sasanian period. We have examples in the royal titles (*šāhān-šāh Ērān* [*ud Anērān*], literally "King of Kings of the Iranians [and non-Iranians]") and in the titles of the civil and military administration: senior officers, dignitaries, and top-grade civil servants have titles such as *Ērān-āmārgar*, a sort of paymaster general, *Ērān-hambāragbed*, the superintendent of the warehouses, *Ērān-dibīrbed*, the head of the bureaucracy, *Ērān-drustbed*, the court surgeon, *Ērān-spāhbed*, the marshal of the empire. These titles have no precedent in the Arsacid period; and even the Parthian royal title *šāhān šāh Aryān*, "King of Kings of the Iranians," which occurs, for instance, in the Kaʿbe-ye Zardošt inscription, is no more than the Parthian version of the Sasanian title, just like the Greek version *basileús basiléōn Arianôn*.

It is clear that the name *Ērān* in the official titles of the new state and its administration was a typically Sasanian usage that came into being in the 3rd century C.E. with the advent of Ardašīr I. In an ideological context where some traditional values were given new life, *Ērān* also appeared in toponyms, in the naming of cities that were renamed or refounded or in the case of newly founded ones. From this point of view some significant place-names are *Ērān-šahr Šābuhr*, *Ērān-āsān-kerd-Kawād* (q.v.), *Ērān-šād-Kawād* (q.v.), *Ērān-win(n)ard-Kawād* (q.v.), *Ērān-xwarrah-Šābuhr* (q.v.) or *Ērān-xwarrah-Yazdgerd* (q.v.; Gyselen, 1989). These last two names are particularly important because they contain the concept of *Ērān xwarrah*, which recalls the Avestan concept of *airyanəm* or *airyanąm xᵛarənō* (see FARR(AH), the 'Iranian' Glory or Glory 'of the Iranians,' so as to form a link between Sasanian royal ideology and archaic myth

and epos, in other words, between the Kayanid tradition and the new dynasty of the Iranian kingdom in the 3rd century C.E. (Gnoli, 1989, pp. 148-51). A situation fairly similar to the one involving *Ērān xwarrah* must also have existed in the case of *Ērān-wēz* (q.v.), a Middle Persian expression that reflected that Avestan *airyanəm vaēǰō* (see above). In both cases there is evidence of an uninterrupted link with the religious tradition, on account of the Middle Persian *ēr*, which is connected not so much with Old Pers. *ariya-* as with an older form with epenthesis, which is documented by the Av. *airya-* in Old Iranian (Eilers, 1974, p. 283; 1982, p. 8; Gnoli, 1986, p. 115). Furthermore it should be noted that, besides the royal titles, civil and military administrative titles, and place-names, also the personal proper names such as *Ērān duxt*, *Ērān-Gušnasp*, *Ērān-xrad* (Gignoux, 1986, pp. 79-80) show how widespread the use of the name *Ērān* was in the Sasanian period. All these factors can only be explained by the pronounced sense of national identity that had begun to emerge from the 3rd century onwards.

Third-century Iran was shaken by a conflict between universalism and nationalism that was most clearly manifest in the religious and cultural sphere. The outcome of this conflict is well known: the traditionalistic and nationalistic impulses gained the upper hand, and Manichean universalism succumbed to the nationalism of the Zoroastrian Magi. Iranian identity, which up to that point had been essentially of a cultural and religious nature, assumed a definite political value, placing Persia and the Persians at the center of the *Ērān-šahr*, in other words, at the center of a state based on the twin powers of throne and altar and sustained by an antiquarian and archaizing ideology. This ideology became more and more accentuated during the Sasanian period, reaching its height in the long reign of Xusraw/Ḵosrow I (531-79 C.E.). Of course, economic and social factors favored the victory of the stronger classes in a society that was based mainly on a rural economy, namely the aristocratic landed and warrior classes and the Magian clergy.

All this largely fitted in with the spirit of the times. Indeed, the formation of national cultures was a typical feature of the third century, marking the transition to Late Antiquity. The idea of a strong national identity, a hallmark of the Sasanian dynasty's rise to power in Iran, must therefore be considered in the light of a phenomenon that was far more widespread, involving on the one hand the Roman empire from East to West and on the other the ecumene that Alexander of Macedon had united six centuries earlier with his conquest of the Persian empire (Gnoli, 1989, pp. 162-64; 1998, pp. 119-22).

In Iran the claim to Achaemenid origins, the identification of the Sasanian dynasty with the dynasty of the Kayanians, the setting up of a traditional heritage that met the requirements of the new dynasty and the social forces that were its mainstay are just so many aspects of a single political and cultural process that was vigorously upheld by the Sasanian propaganda. The tradition of *Ērān-šahr*, which was supposed to have its roots in remote antiquity, though in actual fact at that time there survived only a

vague and scanty knowledge of it (Yarshater, 1971), only goes as far back as the 3rd century C.E. Moreover, there can be no doubt that the Iranian national history is a mirror of Sasanian conditions. Both the Pishdadian and Kayanian periods are treated in a Sasanian way (Yarshater, 1983, pp. 402-11).

The fact is that the advent of the Sasanians gave a national or even nationalistic sense to the various aspects of Iranian culture, which managed to survive the fall of the monarchy and the decline of Zoroastrianism (Spuler). In Sasanian Iran there began to take shape a national culture, fully aware of being "Iranian," that was motivated by the restoration and the revival of the wisdom of the "sages of old," *dānāgān pēšēnīgān*, as well as by the glorification of a great heroic past, and was imbued with an omnipresent antiquarian taste and an archaizing spirit. This process developed steadily in the course of time and took on a definite shape especially in the 6th century, but its roots were nonetheless in the 3rd century, in the transition of power from the Arsacids (q.v.) to the Sasanians and in the Zoroastrian church's gaining of political recognition.

Pahlavi works, which have also come down to us in Arabic or in Persian, reflect the process of formation of an Iranian identity that was based on (1) the combination and revision of various features connected with the epico-legendary tradition—as seen, for instance, in the brief mention of the foundation of each and every "provincial capital" in the *Šahrestānīhā ī Ērān* (Markwart, 1931; Daryaee, 2002)—and (2) the royal ideology of the new dynasty and the view of history in the religious tradition of the *hērbeds* and *mobeds*. The latter is expressed in the *Testament of Ardašīr* (Grignaschi; ʿAbbas; de Fouché-cour, pp. 87-89) and in the *Letter of Tansar* (Darmesteter; Minovi; ʿEqbāl; Boyce, 1968; de Fouchécour, pp. 89-93).

As regards the geographical concepts connected with the imperial propaganda in ancient Iran, we must point out that the Sasanian inscriptions, from Šābuhr to Kerdir, give a list of the Iranian and non-Iranian provinces that alters in part the Avestan concept of the seven climes, whereas a late Sasanian tradition identified the *Ērān-šahr* with the central *kešwar* (see AVESTAN GEOGRAPHY), so that, in a new image of the world, the Persian empire came to coincide with that central region, the *Xᵛaniraθa* (Daryaee, 2002).

It was in the Sasanian period, then, that the pre-Islamic Iranian identity reached the height of its fulfilment in every aspect: political, religious, cultural, and linguistic (with the growing diffusion of Middle Persian). Its main ingredients were the appeal to a heroic past that was identified or confused with little-known Achaemenid origins (Yarshater, 1971; Daryaee, 1995), and the religious tradition, for which the Avesta was the chief source. Both these ingredients were amalgamated in the Sasanian *Xwadāy-nāmag*, whose heroic and legendary character was combined with the "later accretions and elaborations of a non-heroic and religious nature" (Yarshater, 1983, p. 394). This work, which is the main source for Iranian national history, was translated into Arabic by Ebn al-

Moqaffaʿ (q.v.) and, although the original Middle Persian version and the Arabic or Persian translations or adaptations have not survived, it widely influenced Islamic historians, men of letters and poets, as is clearly evidenced by the *Annals* of Ṭabarī and the *Šāh-nāma* of Ferdowsī (q.v.).

Bibliography: E. ʿAbbās, ed., *ʿAhd Ardašīr*, Bayrut, 1967. W. Barthold, "Zur Geschichte des persischen Epos" (tr. from the Russian by H. H. Schaeder), *ZDMG* 147, 1944, pp. 121-57. A. Bausani, *L'Iran e la sua tradizione millenaria*, Roma, 1971. É. Benveniste, "L'Ērān-vēž et l'origine légendaire des Iraniens," *BSOS* 7, 1933-35, pp. 265-74. Idem, *Le vocabulaire des institutions indo-européennes*, 2 vols., Paris, 1969. M. Boyce, "The Parthian *gōsān* and Iranian Minstrel Tradition," *JRAS*, 1957, pp. 10-45. Eadem, *The Letter of Tansar*, Roma, 1968. A. Christensen, *Les Kayanides*, Copenhagen, 1931. Idem, *Les gestes des rois dans les traditions de l'Iran antique*, Paris, 1936. Idem, *L'Iran sous les Sassanides*, 2nd ed., Copenhagen, 1944. J. Darmesteter, "Lettre de Tansar au Roi du Tabaristan," *JA*, 1894, pp. 185-250 and 502-55. T. Daryaee, "National History or Keyanid History? The Nature of Sasanid Zoroastrian Historiography," *Iranian Studies* 28, 1995, pp. 129-41. Idem, *Šahrestānīha ī Ērānsahr. A Middle Persian Text on Late Antique Geography*, *Epic*, *and History*, Costa Mesa, 2002. Idem, "The Changing 'Image of the World' = Geography and Imperial Propaganda in Ancient Persia," *Electrum* 6, 2002, pp. 99-109. W. Eilers, "Verbreitung und Fortleben alter Epenthese," in *Hommage Universel à l'Iran—Commémoration Cyrus. Actes du Congrès de Shiraz 1971 . . .* , Acta Iranica 1-3, 3 vols., Tehran and Liège, 1974, I, pp. 280-91. Idem, *Geographische Namengebung in und um Iran*, München, 1982. ʿA. Eqbāl-Āštiāni, ed., *Tārīḵ-e Ṭabarestān*, Tehran, 1942. C.-H. de Fouchécour, *Moralia. Les notions morales dans la littérature persane du 3ᵉ/9ᵉ au 7ᵉ/13ᵉ siècle*, Paris, 1986. R. N. Frye, *The History of Ancient Iran*. München, 1984.

W. Geiger, *Ostiranische Kultur im Altertum*, Erlangen, 1882. I. Gershevitch, "The Alloglottography of Old Persian," *TPS*, 1979, pp. 114-90. G. Gnoli, "Politica religiosa e concezione della regalità sotto gli Achemenidi," in *Gururājamañjarikā. Studi in onore di Giuseppe Tucci*, Napoli, 1974, pp. 24-88. Idem, "Universalismo e nazionalismo nell'Iran del III secolo," in L. Lanciotti, ed., *Incontro di religioni in Asia tra il III e il X secolo d.C.* (Atti del Convegno di Venezia, 16-18 nov. 1981), Firenze, 1984, pp. 31-54. Idem, "Verso una cultura nazionale iranica," in M. Mazza and C. Giuffrida, eds., *Le trasformazioni della cultura nella tarda antichità* (Atti del Convegno di Catania, 27 sett.-2 ott. 1982), Roma, 1985, pp. 587-96. Idem, "Mittelpersisch *ēr* 'Iranier'," in R. Schmitt and P. O. Skjærvø, eds., *Studia Grammatica Iranica. Festschrift für Helmut Humbach*, München, 1986, pp. 115-24. Idem, "*Ēr mazdēsn*. Zum Begriff Iran und seiner Entstehung im 3. Jahrhundert," in *Transition Periods in Iranian History. Actes du Symposium de Fribourg-en-Brisgau*

(22-24 mai 1985), Paris, 1987, pp. 83-100. Idem, "*Basileús basiléôn Arianốn*," in G. Gnoli and L. Lanciotti, eds., *Orientalia Iosephi Tucci memoriae dicata*, vol. II, Roma, 1987, pp. 509-32. Idem, *The Idea of Iran. An Essay on its Origin*, Roma, 1989. Idem, *Iran als religiöser Begriff im Mazdaismus*, Rheinisch-Westfälische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Vorträge G 320, Opladen, 1993. Idem, "Iranic Identity as a Historical Problem: the Beginnings of a National Awareness under the Achaemenians," in *The East and the Meaning of Histoy. International Conference (23-27 November 1992)*, Roma, 1994, pp. 147-67. Idem, "L'Iran tardo-antico e la regalità sassanide," *Mediterraneo antico. Economia società culture* 1, 1998, pp. 115-39. Idem, "The 'Aryan' Language," *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam* 26, 2002, pp. 84-90. P. Gignoux, "La liste des provinces de l'Iran dans les inscriptions de Šābuhr et de Kirdīr," *AAASH* 19, 1971, pp. 83-94. M. Grignaschi, "Quelques spécimens de la littérature sassanide conservés dans les bibliothèques d'Istanbul," *JA*, 1966, pp. 1-142. A. von Gutschmid, *Geschichte Irans und seiner Nachbarländer von Alexander dem Grossen bis zum Untergang der Arsaciden*, Tübingen, 1888. R. Gyselen, *La géographie administrative de l'Empire sassanide. Les témoignages sigillographiques*, Paris, 1989.

J. Hertel, *Achaemeniden und Kayaniden*, Leipzig, 1924. E. Herzfeld, "Sakastan. Geschichtliche Untersuchungen zu den Ausgrabungen am Kūh i Khwādja," *AMI* 4, 1932, pp. 1-116. Idem, *Archaeological History of Iran*, London, 1935. Idem, *Iran in the Ancient East*, London and New York, 1941. Idem, *Zoroaster and His World*, 2 vols., Princeton, 1947. J. Kellens, "Le mot «aryen» ou le fantasme contre l'analyse," *Bulletin de la Classe des Lettres—Académie Royale de Belgique*, 6ᵉ série, 14/1-6, 2003, pp. 99-112. O. Klíma, "The Official Name of the Pre-Islamic Iranian State," in *Sir J. J. Zarthoshti Madressa Centenary Volume*, Bombay, 1967, pp. 144-46. C. de Lamberterie, "Arménien *ari* et *anari*," in C.-H. de Fouchécour and P. Gignoux, eds., *Études irano-aryennes offertes à Gilbert Lazard*, Paris, 1989, pp. 237-46. V. G. Lukonin, *Kul'tura sasanidskogo Irana*, Moskva, 1969. Idem, *Iran v III veke*, Moskva, 1979. M. Mancini, "Bilingui greco-iraniche in epoca sasanide. Il testo di Šāhpuhr alla Ka'ba-yi Zardust," in *Bilinguismo e biculturalismo nel mondo antico. Atti del colloquio interdisciplinare tenuto a Pisa il 28 e 29 settembre 1987*, Pisa, 1988, pp. 75-99. J. Markwart [Marquart], "Beiträge zur Geschichte und Sage von Eran," *ZDMG* 49, 1895, pp. 628-72. Idem, *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte von Eran* I, Göttingen, 1896, and II, Leipzig, 1905. Idem, *Ērānšahr nach der Geographie des Ps. Moses Xorenac'i*, Berlin, 1901. M. Mayrhofer, *Onomastica Persepolitana*, Wien, 1973. J. de Menasce, "La conquête de l'iranisme et la récupération des mages hellénisés," *Annuaire de l'École Pratique des Hautes Études*, 1956-57, pp. 2-12. M. Minovi, ed., *Tansar-nāma*, Tehran, 1932. D. Monchi-Zadeh, *Topographisch-historische Studien zum iranischen Nationalepos*, Wiesbaden, 1975. T. Nöldeke, *Das iranische Nationalepos*, 2nd ed., Berlin and Leipzig, 1920. D. T. Potts, *The Archaeology of Elam*, Cambridge, 1999.

A. V. Rossi, "La varietà linguistica nell'Iran achemenide," *AIUON*, Sezione linguistica, 3, 1981, pp. 141-96. R. Schmitt, "Zu dem «arischen Ahuramazdā»," *Stud. Ir.* 20, 1991, pp. 189-92. Idem, *Die Iranier-Namen bei Aischylos*, Wien, 1978. A. Shapur Shahbazi, "The History of the Idea of Iran," in Vesta Sarkhosh Curtis and Sarah Stewart, eds., *Birth of the Persian Empire*, London and New York, 2005, pp. 100-111. N. Sims-Williams, "A New Bactrian Inscription of Kanishka the Great, Part I: The Rabatak Inscription, Text and Commentary," *Silk Road Art and Archaeology* 4, 1995-96, pp. 75-96 and 128-37. Idem, *New Light on Ancient Afghanistan. The Decipherment of Bactrian (An Inaugural Lecture Delivered on 1 February 1996, School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London)*, London, 1997. F. Spiegel, *Erânische Altertumskunde*, 3 vols., Leipzig, 1871-78. B. Spuler, "Les Iraniens et le gouvernement des Arabes au début de la domination de l'Islam," *Orientalia Suecana* 33-35, 1984-86, pp. 395-400. O. Szemerényi, "Studies in the Kinship Terminology of the Indo-European Languages," in *Varia 1977*, Acta Iranica 16, Tehran and Liège, 1977, pp. 1-240. J. Wiesehöfer, *Ancient Persia from 550 BC to 650 AD*, 2nd ed., London and New York, 2001. E. Yarshater, "Were the Sasanians Heirs to the Achaemenids?" in *La Persia nel Medioevo* (Atti del Convegno di Roma, 31 marzo-5 aprile 1970), Roma, 1971, pp. 517-31. Idem, "Iranian National History," in *Camb. Hist. Iran* III, Cambridge, 1983, pp. 359-477.

(GHERARDO GNOLI)

iii. MEDIEVAL ISLAMIC PERIOD

Following the cultural shock and the crisis of identity that occurred in the first century after the fall of the Sasanids, the urban literati of Persian origin began to reconstruct the cultural idea of Iran within the Islamic society. A modified version of the pre-modern, Sasanid ethno-national identity, this new cultural identity does not bear much resemblance to the modern notions of political and "civic-national identity" (for definitions, see i, above; for the Sasanid period, see ii, above). The emergence of a new form of Persian as the literary language of Iran, as well as a gradual revival of Iranian traditional history, helped buttress the new Iranian cultural identity. The Persian cultural revival, beginning in the early Abbasid Caliphate, accelerated during the reign of Iranian regional dynasties and laid the foundation of Iranian cultural identity for centuries to come (see IRAN iii. TRADITIONAL HISTORY).

This manner of revival and reconstruction of the Iranian identity was unparalleled among the other ancient cultural areas that were incorporated into the Islamic world. Thus, while Syria and Egypt lost their languages under the hegemony of Arabic, Iran survived as the main cultural area in the emerging Islamic empire that maintained its

distinct linguistic and cultural identity (see, e.g., Frye, pp. 1-6).

A number of authors have recently questioned the revival and reconstruction of Iranian identity in the Islamic period. They contend that the idea of Iran and the continuity of its dynastic history is a modern construct, 'invented' by western Orientalists in the 18th and 19th centuries. Even the name "Iran," they argue, had been rarely used in classical Persian literature, and its frequent use in the *Šāh-nāma* referred to the pre-Islamic era and not to its contemporary existence (Vaziri, 1993; Fragner, 1999). Such interpretations of Iranian identity seem to have been influenced by Eurocentric notions of national identity, drawn from Western civic-territorial experiences of nationhood and nationalism. Pre-modern, non-Western nations do not fit easily into this ethnocentric Western paradigm. The idea of nationhood in societies of Asia is often derived from fictive genealogical and territorial origins and vernacular culture and religion, whereas Western ideas of nationhood have been historically based on the specific boundaries, the development of legal-rational communities, and civic cultures (see Smith, 2004, pp. 132-34; see also i, above).

The present entry examines the revival of Iranian identity and repeated construction in Persian literature of its pre-modern ethno-national historiography from the 9th to the 18th century, long before the emergence of Western nationalism or 'Orientalism.' Iranian identity and the pattern of the use of the term "Iran" in Persian literature evolved in four main phases in the medieval Islamic era: a revival phase under the Persian regional dynasties; a rather complex phase under the Saljuqs, a resurgence phase under the Mongols and Timurids; and finally, the formation of a hybrid Iranian-Shiʿite identity under the Safavids.

IRANIAN IDENTITY IN THE EARLY ISLAMIC PERIOD

The resistance movements. The initial Persian response to the Arab domination seems to have manifested itself in various sectarian movements against the Umayyad rule either through participating in the Kharejite revolts or in the Shiʿite movements (see IRAN ix/2.1. The Advent of Islam in Iran). Influenced by pre-Islamic religious ideas, specially Mazdakism, Persian peasants and artisans took part in a series of rebellions against the Arab domination during the early Abbasid era, including those of Behāfarid (q.v.), Sonbād the Magian, Ostādsis, Moqannaʿ, Bābak, and Māziār (see Sadighi, 1937; Yarshater, 1983b). There is some uncertainty, however, regarding the extent to which "national," or more accurately "ethnic" sentiments, were involved in these revolts. According to some historians, a strong "national" sentiment or even resurrection (*rastāḵiz*) was at the core of these rebellious movements (see, e.g., Zarrinkub, 1957, pp. 207-66). On the other hand, M. Rekaya sees these movements as last-ditch efforts by members of the old elite to hold on to their privileges and devoid of any "national" sentiments (Rekaya, 1973, 1974). Taking a historicizing perspective, H. A. R. Gibb, sees these anti-Arab and anti-Islamic movements as manifestations of Persian resistance "if nationalism is too strong or misleading a term" (Gibb, p. 66; see also Minorsky, 1955, p. 243). Regardless of motivations, it is plausible to assume that the participants in these movements were inspired by various elements of pre-Islamic Persian cultural heritage. The revival of the cultural idea of Iran in the context of the Islamic civilization, however, occurred primarily through the efforts of the Persian literati in the early part of the Abbasid Caliphate and under the rule of Persian regional dynasties.

Iranian regional dynasties. The rise of the Abbasid Caliphate in the mid-8th century—with strong Persian support—helped to bring about the downfall of the Umayyad rule with its policy of Arab supremacy (see Agha, 2003). The shift of the center of the Islamic empire from Syria to Iraq, the central province of the Sasanid empire bearing the rich legacy of Persian and Persianized Aramaean cultures, contributed further to the revival of Iranian identity (see Yarshater, 1998, pp. 54-74; see also Moḥammadi Malāyeri). Furthermore, the rise of *de facto* autonomous Iranian dynasties during the 9th and 10th centuries—in Khorasan (Taherids, 820-872, and Saffarids, 868-903), Central Asia (Samanids, 914-999), and the Caspian region, central, southern, and western Iran (Ziyarids, Kakuyids, and Buyids [q.v.], 932-1056)—contributed significantly to the revival of Persian cultural heritage (see Frye, pp. 186-212). The desire of these dynasties to identify themselves as "Iranians" was manifested in their invented genealogies, which described them as descendents of pre-Islamic kings, and legends as well as the use of the title of *šāhanšāh* by the Buyid rulers (*Tāriḵ-e Sistān*, pp. 200-202; Minorsky, 1955, pp. 244-45; Amedroz, 1905, pp. 393-99; Stern, 1971, p. 538; Bosworth, 1973, pp. 51-62; Madelung, 1969, pp. 168-83). These dynasties provided the Persian literati with the opportunity to revive the idea of Iran.

Persian literati. As an influential stratum in Iran's social hierarchy in the Islamic society, the Persian literati or the "men of the pen" (*ahl-e qalam*), consisted of bureaucrats—including viziers, scribes (*dabir*s), and accountants (*mostawfi*s)—men of letters and poets, historians and geographers, philosophers and Islamic theologians, jurists, and scholars of traditional sciences. *Dabir*s (q.v.), who had survived as a distinct social class after the Arab conquest of Persia, constituted the core of the emerging Persian literati and civilian administration (see DIVĀN iv). They played a significant role in the transmission of pre-Islamic bureaucratic skills and lifestyles under the Arab caliphs and later under Iranian local dynasties and the Turkish potentates. In effect, they provided the social base for the institution of the vizierate. The vizier was the head of the supreme *divān*, and as such was the head of the government's bureaucracy. A common feature of medieval society was the existence of influential bureaucratic families of Persian origin, such as the Jeyhānis, the Balʿamis (qq.v.) and ʿOtbis under the Samanids, the family of Neẓām-al-Molk in the Saljuq period, and, the Jovaynis (q.v.) and the family of Rašid-al-Din Fażl-Allāh under the Il-khanids (see DABIR ii;

Klausner, pp. 37-81). The *dehqān*s (q.v.) also helped the reconstruction of Persian culture from pre-Islamic to the Islamic period. As regional landed gentry, *dehqān*s administered local affairs and collected taxes during the late Sasanid era. In the early Islamic period, *dehqān*s played a significant part in the transmission of stories from the Iranian epic, *Šāh-nāma*, Iranian traditional history, and romances of pre-Islamic Iran (see also Tafaz-zoli, 2000).

Persian literati performed their task by contributing to the formation of the administrative apparatus of the Abbasid empire on the Sasanid model, translation of major works of traditional history and ethics from Middle Persian into Arabic and production of Persian recension of them, reconstruction of Persian genealogies for the Iranian regional dynasties, and initiation and promotion of the *šoʿubiya* literary movement.

The šoʿubiya movement. Those members of Persian literati and a number of Arab poets and prose writers, who were active in the *šoʿubiya* controversy during the 9th and 10th centuries, contributed significantly to the rise of Persian literature and the revival of Iranian cultural identity. Over time, the key term of the Qorʾanic verse 49:13, characterized as the divine order for the equality of all peoples (*šoʿub*) within Islam, was used to refer to a diffuse literary movement known as *šoʿubiya*. The Persian literati used the verse to claim equality with, or supremacy to, the Arab aristocracy. The contrast between the glorious, pre-Islamic Persian civilization and the primitive and unsophisticated tribal lifestyle of the Arab Bedouins is the main theme of the *šoʿubi* literature, which generally satirizes Arabs for their diet of snakes, mice, lizards, and camel milk. Some of the *šoʿubi*s went so far as to deny any virtue in the Arab culture or even in Islam. A vivid example of the claim for Persian superiority may be seen in a poem by Ebrāhim b. Mamšāḏ of Isfahan, a panegyric written for the Saffarid, Yaʿqub b. Layṯ: "I am the son of the noble descendants of Jam, and the inheritance of the kings of Persia has fallen to my lot. . . . I am reviving their glory, which has been lost and effaced by the length of time. . . . Say then to all sons of Hashem: Return to your country in the Hejaz, to eat lizards and to graze your sheep. . . . For I shall mount the throne of kings, by the help of the edge of my sword and the point of my pen" (cited in Yaqut, *Eršād al-arīb*, pp. 322-23; English tr. from Stern, 1971, pp. 541-42). The *šoʿubiya* controversy may be seen as a vivid manifestation of the revival of Iranian ethnic pride and the cultural identity of the time, a variant of pre-modern ethno-nationalism (for a nationalistic interpretation of the movement, see; Homāʾi; Ṣafā, *Adabiyāt* I, 3rd ed., 1959, pp. 25-29; Zarrinkub, 2004, pp. 296-301; as well as Ignaz Goldziher, 1889, tr. 1966, pp. 137-200; and Samuel Stern, p. 545; for modernist denial of a nationalistic element in the movement, see G. Lecomte, p. xiii; and Frag-ner, 1999, pp. 16-18; for a balanced, historicizing view, see, Gibb, 1953; and Mottahedeh, 1976).

Reexamining the meaning of *šoʿub* in the Qorʾān commentaries, Mottahedeh has argued convincingly that the meaning of *šaʿb* in many Persian commentaries, and other sources, does not refer to a large confederacy of genea-logically arranged tribes or *qabāʾel*, but to the territorial identification of non-Arab social groups. In this reading of the text, *šoʿub* clearly refers to Persians and other non-Arabs, who were for the most part sedentary peoples, identifying themselves with a locality. Iranian identity was, therefore, reconstructed mainly on the basis of a territorially oriented view of the origin of the Iranian peoples: those who lived in any part of the Iranian terri-tory (*Irānzamin* or *Irānšahr*) and thus had presumably descended from fictive Iranian ancestors and shared a common Persian culture. This broad basis for the post-Islamic construction of Iranian identity seems to have survived until modern times, providing the foundation for the construction of a distinct Iranian "national identity."

The *šoʿubiya* literary movement not only signified the revival of Iranian ethnic pride, but also became a moti-vating force for preservation and dissemination of Iran's traditional history and cultural heritage with the aid of the emerging Persian literary language.

Persian literature and the revival of Iranian identity. It is widely acknowledged that the rise of the Persian lit-erature during the 9th-11th centuries significantly helped the reconstruction of a distinct Iranian cultural identity during the medieval Islamic era. Evolved from *dari* (q.v.), a vernacular of the eastern regions, the new literature soon developed from a simple, popular folk poetry to the lan-guage of the court and the bureaucracy, producing a stylis-tically refined and sophisticated poetry. Iran, for the first time in her long history, had a cultivated, standardized literary language that became a medium of communica-tion widely accepted by all peoples within its bound-aries. It expanded from Khorasan and Transoxania to the central, southern, and western regions and eventually be-came the *lingua franca* of the chancery and literati of most Islamic dynasties (see IRAN viii. PERSIAN LITERATURE; see also Lazard; Wickens; Richter-Bernburg).

The desire to preserve the ethno-national history of Iran, as depicted in *ḵʷadāy-nāmaq*s, may have been a motive for the Persian literati to promote a written literature in the late Sasanid period as well as New Persian literature in the early Islamic era. It was in these critical periods that the construction of Iranian identity by rearrange-ment of Persian mythologies, legendry narratives, and fac-tual history took place: "A clear concept of Persian identity permeates the traditional history—a concept that may have originated in the Achaemenid period, but was definitely embraced by the Sasanids, who by calling themselves 'kings of Iran and non Iran (*an-ērān*)' clearly distinguished their own nation from the rest" (IRAN iii. TRADITIONAL HISTORY, p. 300). The arranged "national-istic spirit of Sasanid tradition," as Ehsan Yarshater has noted, intended to promote ethnic pride leading to a sense of pre-modern "national identity" for Iranian people. He makes a clear distinction between a belief in the 'primor-dial' origin of Iranian people and Iran's factual history. What is implied by his analysis is that it was the primor-dial feature of these myths and symbols, rather than the

truth of their historical narratives, that provided the Iranian people with a sense of common origin as a pre-modern "nation." These symbols and myths had long been used as 'border guardians' for preserving the cultural identity of Iranians against the inroads of non-Iranians (*anērān*), including the Turanians, and the Hephthalites (q.v.). Preserved and disseminated by the *šāh-nāma*s, these historical memories laid the foundation of Iranian cultural identity as preserved in classical Persian literature.

The first part of Ferdowsi's (q.v.) *Šāh-nāma* reveals the roots of Iranian identity in ancient mythology. Ahura Mazda created the first man and the first king who laid the foundation of Iranian origin. It was the Kayanid Faridun (see FARĒDUN) who divided the world into three parts with peoples of distinct ethnic characters and identities. Examining the basic characters of his three sons, Faridun assigned them to rule over the people of similar characters. Iran, occupying the middle clime, the best part of the world, was assigned to Iraj (q.v.), while *Rum* (Greece and Rome), on Iran's western flank, was assigned to Salm, and Turān and China, on the eastern flank, were assigned to Tur. Salm, the king of Rum, is the prototype of the wise, patient ruler. Tur, the king of "Turān and Čin" (i.e., Central Asia) is characterized as being impatient, courageous, and passionate. Iraj, the king of Iran, partakes of both these traits in his character. He is wise, patient, and prudent yet able to act swiftly and boldly if warranted (*Šāh-nāma*, ed. Khaleghi I, pp. 104-55; for further discussion of Iranian ethnic character, see Ashraf, 1994).

Rooted deeply in Persian cosmology and cosmogony (q.v.), an important element of Iranian identity is the notion that Iran is destined to be buffeted forever by its external enemies, who, out of jealousy and fear, conspire continually against the kingdom and its people. The enemies of Iran, be they the wise Westerners or the fearless people of the East, are linked to the evil forces of Ahriman. *Iran* itself, came into being at the same time as *anērān* ("non-Iran" or "anti-Iran"). During the reign of the Kayanids a war breaks out among the three parts of the world, with the conflict between Iran and Turān reaching a new height. Alexander invades Iran, overthrows the Kayanids, and on the advice of his mentor, Aristotle, concocts the second major conspiracy against Iran by dividing the country into several regions, leading to the rule of local princes and governors (*moluk al-ṭawāyef*). This is done in the hope of obviating the Persian threat against the West (Greek and Roman world; for Aristotle's letter to Alexander, see Stern, 1970, pp. 25-34). Even worse is his pillaging of Persian cultural treasures of sacred knowledge, philosophy, science, and technology, some of which are translated while the original versions are destroyed. As a result, the translation of Greek works to Persian during the late Sasanid era and to Arabic during the early Islamic period may be seen as returning the Persian repertoire of knowledge back into the hands of their original possessors (see Bailey, p. 155; Ebn al-Nadim, p. 300; *Mojmal al-tawāriḵ wa'l-qeṣaṣ*, p. 10; see also Gutas, pp. 34-52).

Many of the myths surrounding these events, as they appear in the *Šāh-nāma*, were of Sasanid origin, during whose reign political and religious authority become fused and the comprehensive idea of Iran was constructed (see IRAN iii. TRADITIONAL HISTORY; see also Gnoli, 1988; and ii, above).

The idea of fusing Zoroastrian and Abrahamic traditions through creating genealogical links between Persian kings and Biblical prophets, or even merging them into one as reflections of the same entity, as conceived, *inter alia*, by Ṭabari (d. 923), Balʿami (q.v.; d. 963), and Gardizi (q.v.; d. 1050) led to legitimizing the roots of Iranian identity in Islamic society. The motivation behind forming this idea may be attributed to a scholarly obsession to forge a symbiosis of fecund and powerful systems of beliefs that happened to co-exist at the same time in the same cultural milieu, or to the lack of knowledge of pre-Parthian factual history, or to a genuine desire for legitimization of Persian roots—which seems to be the case for Gardizi and the translators of Ṭabari's *Tafsir*—or an amalgam of all these factors. Yet, regardless of motivation, the dissemination of this idea helped to legitimize the roots of Iranian identity for the devout Persian Muslims for the later centuries.

Treating the history of children of Abraham and ancient Persians synchronously, Ṭabari suggests that the Persians believe Kayomarṯ (see GAYŌMARD) was Adam and Hušang-e Pišdād (see HOŠANG), Kayomarṯ's grandson and successor, was the first man to rule over the seven regions of the earth. In fact, according to some Persian legends, Hušang was the son of Adam and Eve. The story of Solomon is followed by the story of mythical Persian kings. In his rendition of Ṭabari's history, Balʿami quotes contradictory legends and beliefs about the creation of man and society in order to demonstrate the evolution of the Iranian and Arab wings of the Islamic civilization. Iranian and Abrahamic myths are brought together to form a unified body of mythology (Ṭabari, I, pp. 100 ff.; Balʿami, pp. 112-17). Other Islamic historians, including Maqdesi (Moqaddasi; d. 1004) and Masʿudi (d. ca. 956), also attempted to reconcile and synchronize the Persian and Abrahamic traditions.

In the course of the intermingling of "Arab and Persian" aristocracy, one may note the emergence of a Persianized Islamic geographical notion that the region comprising the land of Persia and Arabia was selected by God as the center of the three climes (q.v.; *kešvar*s) of the earth and were inhabited by the noblest of peoples. Thus, genealogies of both Persian and Arab nobility were honored in the new territory. In Gardizi's words, "And God created different peoples as the land including Mecca, Medina, Ḥejāz, Yemen, Iraq, Khorasan, Nimruz and parts of Šām (Syria) are known in Persian as Iran." He further adds, that "from the beginning of the world until now [its] people have been respected and have been masters of all around them and none has been taken as slave by other lands. . . . the people of this mid-clime of the world are wiser, more courageous and more generous than others and their neighbors are inferior to them in all these respects" (see

Gardizi, *Zayn al-akbār*, p. 255). Also implied in Gardizi's conception of identity is the notion that territorial ties represent genealogical origins (for an informative survey of traditional cartography and the conception of borders and partitions in Islamic societies, see Hartley and Woodward, I/1.).

Still a novel idea to unify the Persian and Abrahamic traditions was conceived by translators of Ṭabari's *Tafsir* (exegesis of the Qurʾan) from Arabic to Persian. In an introduction to the translation they noted, "He [The Almighty God] said, 'I have never sent a messenger except one conversant in the language of his people and a language comprehensible to them.' Furthermore, the Persian language was known from the earliest times and from the time of Adam until the era of Ishmael the prophet all divine messengers and all rulers on earth spoke in Persian. The first person to speak in the Arabic tongue was Ishmael the prophet; and our Prophet came from amongst the Arabs and the Qurʾan was sent down to him in Arabic; but here in this region the language is Persian, and the rulers here are of Persian descent" (tr. of Ṭabari's *Tafsir*, 1960, p. 5).

The existence of a distinct cultural conception of being Iranian (*Irāniyat*) is most dramatically demonstrated in the trial of Afšin (q.v.) in 840. He was the hereditary ruler of Ošrusana and the commander who defeated Bābak's (q.v.) 20-year-long rebellion to save the Abbasids. Afšin, who was accused of propagating Iranian ethno-national sentiment, said, "Didn't I communicate to you [i.e., those who testified against him] my inner secrets and tell you about the concept of Persian national consciousness (*al aʿjamiyya*) and my sympathies for it and for its exponents?" (Ṭabari, tr., XXXIII, p. 189). This episode clearly reveals not only the presence of a distinct awareness of Iranian cultural identity and the people who actively propagated it, but also of the existence of a concept (*al-aʿjamiya* or *Irāniyat*) to convey it.

To examine some of the ways in which the idea of Iran and its pre-modern ethno-national history has found expression in Persian literature, we shall briefly survey in the following sections the territorial and ethnic vocabulary of the concept of "Iran" and its related terms, as well as the frequency and pattern of its usage in Persian literature during several periods of Iran's history over a millennium, stretching from the 9th-10th to the 19th century.

Territorial and ethnic vocabulary for Iran. Territorial notions of "Iran," are reflected in such terms as *irānšahr*, *irānzamin*, or *Fors*, the arabicized form of *Pārs/Fārs* (Persia). The ethnic notion of "Iranian" is denoted by the Persian words *Pārsi* or *Irāni*, and the Arabic term *ahl al-fors* (inhabitants of Persia) or ʿAjam, referring to non-Arabs, but primarily to Persians as in *molk-e ʿAjam* (Persian kingdom) or *moluk-e ʿAjam* (Persian kings). The term Tāzik/Tājik found currency as a term referring to Persian people during the period of Turkic domination. The Persian term *kešvar* (country) was used in pre-modern times to denote both the clime (e.g., *haft kešvar* [q.v.] "seven climes") and the dynastic realm or kingdom. The latter usage of the term only rarely conveyed

the meaning of "country" in medieval historiography. The most common equivalent of *kešvar* was the Arabic *mamlakat* from the root *malaka*, meaning "to own or to rule" (e.g., *malek* "king" and *mālek* "owner"). *Mamlakat* was often used in Persian historiography for territorially defined kingdoms or dynastic realms and its constituent provinces, e.g., *mamlakat-e Irān* or *mamālek-e Irān* or *mamālek-e mahrusa-ye Irān* "protected kingdom of Iran" (during the Mongol era and thereafter), *mamlakat-e Korāsān* or *Fārs* or *Kermān* (see below). The Arabic terms *welāyat* and *eyālat* until recently referred to provinces. The old terms *watan* (Ar.) or *mihan* (Pers.) were used in classical Persian literature to refer predominantly to a person's place of birth and habitation. One's place of birth and residence was considered as the object of one's love, admiration, and devotion (see Ashraf, 1993, pp. 159-64; 1994. pp. 521-50; Lambton, 1978, pp. 785-90). The term "Iran," has stood for the kingdom of Iranian dynasties and the homeland of the Iranian people since the mythical foundation of the country by Faridun. *Irānšahr* (see ĒRĀNŠAHR), a Sasanid concept, conveys the meaning of the kingdom of the rulers of Iran. These territorial conceptions of Iran were, in particular, significant for identification of Iranian people, who were more concerned with their territorial ties, than Arabs, who were primarily identified with their lineage.

It is important to note that the term "Iran" constitutes only one of the elements that define Iranian identity in its ethnic, cultural, and territorial totality. This may be seen in such monumental works as Bayhaqi's *History*, ʿOnsor-al-Maʿāli's *Qābus-nāma*, Neẓām-al-Molk's *Siāsat-nāma*, Neẓāmi's *Haft peykar* and *Kosrow o Širin*, Hafez's (q.v.) *Divān*, and Saʿdi's *Bustān* and *Golestān*. These works, while rarely mentioning "Iran," present the various aspects of Persian cultural heritage and historical memories, including myths and legends, worldviews and moral values, mores and norms of social behavior, principles of political legitimacy and social relations, as well as imagined genealogical origins of the Iranian people. Yet, the survey of the frequency and pattern of the usage of "Iran" and its derivatives in Persian literature must be taken into account in the context of claims by those authors who base much of their argument on the rarity of the occurrence of the usage of the word "Iran" in Persian literature in contradistinction to its frequent application in modern times, a radical innovation that they attribute to the writings of 18th and 19th century Orientalists who passed this legacy to the Pahlavi state, which in turn bolstered and institutionalized it through legislation in 1935 by changing the official name of the country from Persia to Iran (Vaziri, 1993; Fragner, 1999). These frequencies are driven from the indexes of selected historical writings. In interpreting them, however, caution must be exercised, since the criteria used by various indexers and the precision of their efforts may vary considerably from work to work. They are, nevertheless, suggestive of the pattern of the usage of the terms in each period. To simplify the findings of the survey the frequency of the use of the term "Iran" in each period is pre-

sented in terms of the average number of terms appeared in each of the historical works of that era.

The remaining part of this section will describe the frequency and pattern of usage of the term "Iran" in Persian literature under the Iranian regional dynasties, during whose rule the pre-modern ethno-national history of Iran was revived and the foundation of Iranian cultural identity was reconfirmed. These same frequencies and patterns of usage in literatures of the Saljuqid, Il-khanid-Timurid, and Safavid eras will be treated in the sections that follow.

The usage of the term "Iran" in the early Persian literature. The period between the birth of literary Persian poetry in the late 9th century and the composition of the *Šāh-nāma* by Ferdowsi in the late 10th century marks the flourishing of the usage of "Iran" in the emerging Persian prose and poetry. A unique feature of this period is the creation of a corpus of Iranian epic literature and romances dealing with pre-Islamic Iran, using the pre-Islamic notion of Iran and its related terms (see Ṣafā, 1984, pp. 160-342). References to *Irān* and *Irānzamin*, its myths and legends, its kings and notables (*gozinān-e Irān*) begin to appear in a number of books of kings, including Masʿudi Marvazi's *Šāh-nāma* (ca. 912), Abu Manṣuri' *Šāh-nāma* (ca. 960; although we only have fragments in the form of a preface), and Daqiqi's (q.v.; d. 976) 1,000 lines narrating the reign of Goštasp that were used by Ferdowsi (see Qazvini, 1953, pp. 5-90). It is, however, in Ferdowsi's *Šāh-nāma* (d. 1019 or 1025), that the Iranian worldview and its mythological and legendary history, as well as its later factual history (Parthian and Sasanid periods) is presented with utmost eloquence; in it the name "Iran" and its related terms are used 720 times and "Iranians" 350 times.

A group of Persian literati, who wrote in Arabic during the formative period of Islamic historiography, began to introduce specifically Persian themes and frequently referred to "Iran" and "Iranian" (or in its Arabicized form, Fors or ʿAjam) in the context of Iranian traditional history. Beginning with the pioneering and influential translation of the *Kʷadāy-nāmag* from Pahlavi into Arabic by Ebn al-Moqaffaʿ (q.v.; d. 757; as well as a number of other translations), Persian literati continued to elaborate on the pre-Islamic traditional history of Iran. Notable among them were Ebn Qotayba's (q.v.; d. 889) various works, including *ʿOyun al-akbār*, referring on various occasions to the Persian history and cultural heritage; Dinavari (d. 895), who dedicates a large part of his *Akbār al-ṭewāl* to the narratives of pre-Islamic Iran; Ṭabari (d. 923), who devotes a book of his monumental *History* to similar topics; Ḥamza Eṣfahāni (d. 962), who, with deep pride and passion for Iran (*taʿaṣṣob al-fors*), dedicates a large part of his *Seni moluk al-arż* to the narratives of pre-Islamic Iranian kings. Other historical works of the same category include Ebn Meskawayh's (q.v.; d. 1030) *Tajāreb al-omam* and *Tahḏib al-akbār*, Ṯaʿālebi's (d. 1038) *Ḡorar akbār moluk al-fors*, and Biruni's (d. 1048) *Āṯār al-bāqiya*. It was within this tradition that a number of prominent Arab historians too, wrote extensively on Iran's history,

including Maqdesi's (d. 945) *Ketāb al-badʾ waʾl-taʾrik*, Masʿudi's (d. 956) *Moruj al-ḏahab* and *Ketāb al-tanbih waʾl-ešrāf*, and Yaʿqubi's (d. 987) *Taʾrik*. Mention must also be made of such influential works in Persian as Balʿami's (d. 962) redaction of Ṭabari's history, which marks the beginning of Persian historiography, and Gardizi's (d. 1050) *Zayn al-akbār*, whose concentration on Iran was extensive (for discussion on Persian historiography of this period, see Daniel, 1990, pp. 282-321; and Meisami, 2000, pp. 348-74). On average, on 76 occasions the term *Irān* and related concepts were used in each of the above historical works (including Ṭabari's *Tārik* with 292 cases, and an average of 55 references without counting his work).

The significance of these works lies, not only in their frequent use of the terms *Irān* and *Irānšahr*, or *Fors* and *ʿAjam* but in the institutionalization in Islamic historiography of the traditional history of Iran as a major chapter in the history of the ancient world. Their narrative of Iran's ancient history was repeatedly copied and presented in the later periods. As noted, the term "Iran" in these works refers to various aspects of Iran's traditional history in the pre-Islamic era. Such references, however, helped establish the idea of the territorial and genealogical origin of the Iranian people, which provided the foundation of Iranian cultural identity in the subsequent centuries. Another factor in the survival of Iran's ethno-national history may be the widespread reading and reciting of the *Šāh-nāma* by storytellers whose audiences included individuals from all walks of life. The focus of the Persian epic literature and historical writings of this period was mainly on pre-Islamic Iran, referring for the most part to the historical notion of Iran in the pre-Islamic era rather than to the contemporary living reality of Iran after the Islamic conquest.

Contemporary notions of "Iran" began to emerge in this period when the pioneers of Persian poetry started to use the term in reference, albeit symbolically, to contemporary events. Such references to the contemporary Iranian kings, kingdoms, rulers, commanders, sages, and lands are found in several *divān*s of Persian poetry from this period. For example, Rudaki (d. 941), calls a Saffarid governor of Sistān a nobleman of the Sasanid stock and "pride of Iran" (*mafkar-e Irān*), which implies a sense of continuity in Iranian identity from the Sasanid to the Samanid era (*Tārik-e Sistān*, pp. 319-20). Abu Šakur Balki (in *Āfarin-nāma* [947]; cited by Sajjādi, p. 751), refers to the "sage of Iran." Furthermore, reference to the contemporary conception of "Iran" flourished under the early Ghaznavids.

The Ghaznavid transitional phase. During the early Ghaznavid period, which marks the beginnings of Turkic domination, the cultural life and literary tradition of the Samanids continued. The early Ghaznavids were raised as slave soldiers in the Samanid military institution and spent a period of their character formation within the rich cultural ambience of the Persian court (Bosworth, p. 61). It was in this atmosphere that Persian literati invented genealogies to connect the Ghaznavids to the Sasanids.

According to a genealogy cited by Juzjāni, Sebüktigin, through six generation from his father, was the descendant of Yazdgerd III's daughter (see Bosworth, p. 61). This genealogical invention is similar to the efforts by Persians to cast the fourth Shiʿite Imam as the maternal grandson of the last Sasanid king Yazdgerd III by supportive genealogies (see further below). As a result, there are references to "Iran" as a contemporary entity in the poetry of this period. A prominent poet of this period, Farroḵi Sistāni (d. 1030), mentions "Iran" over 30 times in his *Divān*, referring to Sultan Maḥmud and his sons as *šah-e Irān* (and Turān) and *ḵosrow-e Irān*, and also makes references to *irānšahr* and *irānzamin* (*Divān*, ed. Dabirsiāqi, index); ʿOnṣori (d. 1040), refers to the "Iranian king" (*šāh-e Irān*, *ḵosrow-e Irān*), "Iranian kingdom" (*kešvar-e Irān*), and "Iranian lands" (*irānzamin* and *zamin-e irānšahr*; *Divān*, ed. Dabirsiāqi, Index); Manučehri (d. 1041), refers to "Iran" and "Turān" and *ḵosrow-e Irān*. References to "Iran" are also found in the *divān*s of Abu Ḥanifa Eskāfi (d. 1041) as well as in Asadi Ṭusi's *Divān* (d. 1073). Asʿad Gorgāni's *Vis o Rāmin* (ca. 1072, Index) refers to "Iran" on 25 occasions (for surveys of references to "Iran" in Persian classical poetry, see Sajjādi, pp. 749-59; Matini, pp. 243-68; Šafiʿi Kadkani, pp. 1-26).

Two novel developments under Sultan Maḥmud significantly helped the foundation of Persian hegemony. The first was the converting of all chancery records and correspondences from Arabic to Persian by the order of Maḥmud's first vizier, Abu'l-Ḥasan Esfarāʾeni (q.v.). Although his successor, Aḥmad b. Ḥasan Maymandi (q.v.), restored Arabic, Esfarāʾeni's practice marked the beginning of the establishment of Persian as the literary language of the chancery in the courts of the Turkish and Mongol dynasties in Iran, Central Asia, Muslim India, and Anatolia in the coming centuries. Furthermore, Sultan Maḥmud's conquest of India marked the beginning of Persian influence in the subcontinent (see INDIA ii).

Although the hierarchical notion of "Turk and Tāzik," which became prevalent under the Ghaznavids, dealt a blow to the use of the term "Iran," the increasing hegemony of Persian language helped elevate Iran's cultural heritage and its expression in the Persian literature of this period. Bayhaqi, for example, identified himself as a "Tāzik," but used the term very rarely; his matchless *History* contains a wealth of Persian cultural memories, descriptions of the festivals of *nowruz* and *mehregān*, court grandeur and etiquette, as well as the Persian modes of social and political relations. In a telling passage on the occasion of the coronation of the Saljuqid, Sultan Ṭoḡrel, Bayhaqi states that when "the audience hall appeared devoid of all splendor and glitter," Judge Ṣāʿed addresses the Sultan, "May the lord's life be long! Take note that this is Sultan Masʿud's throne that you are sitting on. . . . Such unforeseeable events do happen and one cannot know what further happenings will emerge from the Unseen." The Sultan replies, "We are new to this land, and as strangers, unacquainted with the manners and customs of the Tāziks [Persian]" (cited from, *History of Bayhaqi*, annotated tr. with introd. by C. E. Bosworth

and M. Ashtiany, forthcoming). This passage shows how the Ghaznavids were known for their familiarity, as well as sympathy, with Persian customs and how the rising Saljuq sultans were ignorant of Persian cultural heritage. It also signifies how a member of the religious ranks of Persian literati was concerned with the Persian style of court etiquette and ceremony.

IRANIAN IDENTITY DURING THE SALJUQIDS

Iranian identity underwent a period of complex mutations with mixed consequences under the Saljuqids. In this period, the decline of Persian epic and the less frequent usage of the term "Iran" in Persian poetry and historiography coincided with the flourishing of Persian literature and spread of Persian hegemony in Islamic societies.

Turkic dynasties were for the most part military states bent on war and conquest and imposed an exogenous rule over their Persian subjects. However, the Persian literati took control over many organs of the state administration and from such positions of influence reintroduced their Persian cultural heritage. With the Turkic rise to power, the 'sword' and the 'pen,' which had been reunified in the Persian hands during the Iranian regional dynasties, were once again separated. The sword and the pen symbolically represented two pillars of the sovereignty of the ruling classes: "military class" and "administrative class" respectively (it should be noted here that the military contingents of Persian origin continued to function, but as a secondary force on command). Thus, the rise of the Turkic slaves and tribes to power in the 11th-12th centuries led to a new binary division of "Turk and Tāzik/Tājik" and less frequent usage of "Iran" in Persian historical and literary works of this period (for a useful survey of the usage of Tāzik/Tājik in Persian literature, see Dabirsiāqi, 1991).

The long period of Turkish rule in Iran could itself be divided into a number of distinct periods in terms of Iranian identity: the Ghaznavid transitional period with the continuity of Samanid tradition (see above); the Saljuq period, marking a complex situation for Iranian identity; the Mongol and Timurid phase, during which the name "Iran" was used for the dynastic realm and a pre-modern ethno-national history of Iranian dynasties was arranged; and the period from the Safavids to the end of the Qajars, when a clear Iranian-Shiʿite identity, based on an amalgamation of Turk and Fārs elements, emerged. It is interesting to note that the Persian literati invented complete genealogies to connect both the first and the last Turkic dynasties that ruled Iran to the pre-Islamic dynasties: the Ghaznavids and the Qajars (see below).

The complex phase under the Saljuqs. Although the great Saljuqs reunified Iran for the first time since the Arab conquest of Persia, the use of the term "Iran" to denote the dynastic realm was not encouraged. This can be attributed to further Islamization of Iranian society and institutionalization of the Islamic state with a universalistic outlook. In fact, the Saljuqs founded a religio-political system by combining the temporal authority of the sultan with the symbolic religious authority of the caliph.

Neẓām-al-Molk played a pivotal role in the establishment of Islamic orthodoxy and universalism as an integral part of the Saljuqid state (Bondāri Eṣfahāni, pp. 66-67). The Neẓāmiya schools, which were created at his behest, contributed to the interconnection between the state and religious establishments and helped strengthen the status of civil administration and men of the pen vis-à-vis the men of the sword in the Islamic state. The literati of Persian origin, who were trained in both Persian literary tradition and Islamic law at these schools, continued to serve as bureaucratic agents in various Islamic governments in the ensuing centuries and were responsible for spreading the Persian language and culture throughout the Islamic world (see also Klausner, 1973; Lambton, 1980, pp. 203-82).

There was a decline in the usage of "Iran" in Persian historiography (see, Ṣafā, 1984, pp. 154-59; 1977, pp. 126-44, 158-60), with only few references, made to "Iran" or even "Tāzik" in the works of such historians of this period as Bondāri Eṣfahāni's (d. 1100) *Tāriḵ-e selsela-ye Saljuqi*, and Nasavi's (d. 1253) *Sirat-e Jalāl-al-Din Minkoberni*. The latter (pp. 47, 75) refers to "Iran" on two occasions: the first regarding Goštāsp (q.v.), king of Iran, and the second regarding Neẓām-al-Molk, the grand vizier (*dastur*) of Iran and Turān. Esfazāri's *Rawżāt al-jannāt fi awṣāf madinat al-Herāt* (p. 162) also has one reference to Neẓām-al-Molk as the grand vizier of *mamālek-e Irān*.

The decline of Persian epic literature and its eventual replacement by Islamic epics or a synthesis of Iranian and Islamic myths and legends must be considered as another distinct feature of this period. This synthesis prefigures post-Mongol and Safavid developments. Thus, although the *ʿAli-nāma* contains both an implicit and explicit rejection of purely Iranian epics, the genre of *pand-nāma* anthologies, which quoted didactic lines from the *Šāh-nāma* side by side with moral dicta from Imam ʿAli, are emblematic of this forthcoming fusion.

The decline in the number of references to "Iran" in this period is also evident in Persian poetry, as seen in the *divān*s of Sanāʾi and Anvari. An illustration of the zealous, anti-Iranian Islamic attitude may be seen in the poems of Amir-Moʿezzi (d. 1147) and Sayf-al-Din Farḡāni (q.v.; d. early 14th century). Unaware of the meaning and cultural significance of myths and legends, Amir-Moʿezzi accuses Ferdowsi of lying and wild exaggerations in his treatment of Rostam (*Divān-e Amir Moʿezzi*, p. 286). By contrast, the poet Saʿdi, quite conscious of the social functions of myths, wrote: "The exploits of the champion Rostam and the brazen-bodied Esfandiār are narrated in fable in order to make rulers and kings realize that this world itself is a memento and a legacy derived from many people from the past" (*Kolliyāt*, p. 724). Farḡāni, went so far, on the other hand, as to say that the soil and water of Iran are not suitable for a Muslim's prayer, because the Sasanid kings had rendered it *najess*, i.e., ritually impure (*Divān*, p. 31).

Yet, even in this period, one finds works of Persian epic, such as Irānšāh's *Kuš-nāma* and *Bahman-nāma* (ca. 1117), that make frequent references to "Iran," nearly 160 times in the former case and over 100 times in the latter (see Matini, p. 259). "Iran" is also mentioned in such important historical works as Ebn Esfandiār's (d. 1217, q.v.) *Tariḵ-e Ṭabarestān*, referring to "Iran" on six occasions and to Tāzik on 11 occasions. *Mojmal al-tawāriḵ waʾl-qeṣaṣ* (ca. 1126), refers to "Iran" on 29 occasions; Moḥamamd b. ʿAli Rāvandi's (d. 1238) *Rāṭhat al-ṣodur* mentions ʿAjam in 17 cases; and Ebn Balḵi's *Fārs-nāma* (early 12th century) also refers to pre-Islamic Iran, its sovereigns, and foundation of cities on various occasions.

Although overt references to "Iran" are relatively rare in this period, abundant mention of its manifestations can be seen in Persian literature. ʿOnsor-al-Maʿāli, well versed in Persian cultural heritage, authored *Qābus-nāma*, a rare handbook of cultural values and norms of social behavior in almost all major aspects of Persian everyday life. There is, however, no mention of "Iran" or "Tāzik" in this book, making merely six references to "ʿAjam" instead. Neẓām-al-Molk (d. 1092) in his influential work *Siāsat-nāma* simply refers to Persians as Tāziks, while making numerous references to Persian political and cultural heritage in narrating anecdotes and collective memories relating to Iran. In his collection of 'advices' from 75 kings, prophets, caliphs, and sages, Ẓahiri Samarqandi presents advices of 38 Iranian mythological, legendary, and historical figures from Jamšid to Sultan Sanjar (mostly from pre-Islamic times), 30 Arab caliphs, and seven Greek, Indian, and Chinese figures. Considering Jamšid as the founder of civilization, he begins the work with a long treatment of his contributions and advices. Similarly, Saʿdi and Hafez—though of later period—who make few references to "Iran" or "ʿAjam" or "Tāzik" in their prose or poetry make many references to the Iranian repertoire of myths and legends as well as Persian ideas, values, mores, and modes of conduct. In the same vein, Neẓāmi, while rarely using the term "Iran," eternalizes the romances of pre-Islamic Iran in his *Ḵamsa* (five *maṯnavi*s).

It was also in the Saljuq era that Persian established itself as a literary language, not only on a par with Arabic, but more important than Arabic in certain genres, including mystical poetry (for the role of mystical literature in reconstruction of Iranian ethnic identity, see Meskoob, 1992). Furthermore, it was in this period that Persian, as the first *lingua franca*, began to spread in medieval Islamic civilization as a trans-regional means of communication of chancery and literati. In the course of time, 'Perian hegemony' established itself in the Ottoman empire, Central Asia, the Mughal empire in India, and South-East Asia (for the notion of "Persian hegemony," see i, above).

THE IDEA OF "IRAN" UNDER THE MONGOLS AND TIMURIDS

The fall of the Abbasid Caliphate, the symbolic guardians of Islamic universalism, in the 13th century, accompanied by a shift from religious orthodoxy to relative religious tolerance and the unification of the Iranian plateau under the Il-khanids, signaled a new era in the history of Iranian identity. These developments provided

the Persian literati with a new opportunity to rearrange the ethno-national history of Iran and reinstate—for the first time since the fall of the Sasanid empire—the usage of *Iran* and *Irānzamin* as appellation for their dynastic realm.

Also contributing to the new concept of Iran, its global location, and its place in history was the emergence of genuinely "universal" and "world" histories with divisions into different regions describing the mores and manners of the different civilizations, such as the Indians or the Franks (Europeans). It is in this vein that Rašid-al-Din's *Jāmeʿ al-tawārik* is often referred to as the first "world history," reflecting the Mongol conception of universal rule and world domination. This new historical outlook was prompted by the Mongols' sweeping advances, east and west, into Europe and elsewhere, combined with their own innate curiosity about different religions.

The prominent historians of this period frequently referred to *Iran* and *Irānzamin* both as historical notions and as contemporaneous entities. Rašid-al-Din Fażl-Allāh (d. 1318) refers repeatedly to "Iran" in his monumental work *Jāmeʿ al-tawārik*, as well as in his *Tārik-e mobārak-e Ḡāzāni* and *Sawāneḥ al-afkār*. He also makes a number of references to the country of Iran (*kešvar-e Iran*). This appears to be one of the first instances of the usage of the concept of country (*kešvar*) to denote the contemporary kingdom of Iran. On another occasion, he refers to the borders of Iran as extending from the Āmuya river to the Jhelum river in northern India (Āb-e Javn) in the east, and from Byzantium (Rum) to Egypt in the west (pp. 46, 73, 147). Other references to Iran include "Peoples of Iran" (*ahāli-e* or *kalāyeq-e Irānzamin*), "provinces of Iran" (*mamālek-e Irānzamin*), "Khan of Irānzamin," and "sovereigns of Iran" (*moluk-e Iran*). Influenced by the new conception of the "world," Rašid-al-Din, like many other historians and geographers, mentions Iran, Turān, Farang, Egypt and Morocco (Maḡreb), Byzantium (Rum), India, and China in referring to the kingdoms of the time, signifying a distinct identity for Iran among major countries of the world (for a pioneering survey of resurgence of the use of the term "Iran" during the Mongol period, see Krawulski, 1978, pp. 11-17).

Other historical works, including Banākati's (q.v.; d. 1330) *Tārik-e Banākati*, Šabānkāraʾi's *Majmaʿ al-ansāb* (1333), Nakjavāni's (d. 1336) *Dastūr al-kāteb*, Ḥamd-Allāh Mostawfi's (d. 1349) *Tārik-e gozida*; and ʿAbd-al-Razzāq Samarqandi's (d. 1371) *Maṭlaʿ-e saʿdayn wa majmaʿ-e baḥrayn* make frequent references to Iran and its related terms. Describing a battle in which Sultan Üljeytu barely defeats his adversaries, Samarqandi exclaims that "if it were not due to God's benevolence nothing would have remained of the kingdom of Iran but name" (p. 43); On another occasion he outlines the borders of the Abu Saʿidi kingdom from Oxus to Euphrates and underlines that "Irānšahr consists of the cities lying between the two borders" (p. 121). Other historical works that make numerous references to "Iran" include Ḥāfeẓ-e Abru's (d. 1417) *Zobdat al-tawārik* and *Joḡrāfiā*, Tāj-al-Din Ḥasan Yazdi's (d. 1453) *Jāmeʿ al-tawārik-e Ḥasani*,

and Mir Moḥammad b. Sayyed Borhān-al-Din Ḵᵛāvand-šāh's (Mirḵᵛānd; d. 1497), *Rawżat al-ṣafā*.

Finally, it is noteworthy that, in a surviving collection of chancery correspondence between rulers of Iran and neighboring kingdoms from the early Timurid to the early Safavid periods, 19 references can be found to the contemporary notions of *Iran*, *Irānzamin*, *kešvar-e Irān* (country of Iran, p. 690), *šāhanšāh-e Irān* (king of kings of Iran), *aḥwāl-e Irān* (conditions of Iran), *moluk-e Irān* (rulers of Iran), *mamālek-e Irān* (provinces of Iran), *šahriār-e diār-e ʿAjam* (the ruler of Iran), *sepahsālār-e Irān* (military commander of Iran), and *Irān o Turān* (see Navāʾi, 1977, Index). On average, on 42 occasions the term Iran and related concepts were used in each of the above historical works of this period, referring to both pre-Islamic and Islamic eras.

Reconstruction of pre-modern national history. The significance of the historiography and historical geography of this era is not limited to the frequent usage of "Iran" and related terms or even the reinstatement of the term *Irānzamin*. It extends to the reconstruction of new conception of Iran's "pre-modern ehtno-national history" in terms of a continuum of dynastic histories from the primordial mythological era to the Mongol period. This mode of presentation of Iran's history, linking the traditional history of Iran, as reconstructed by the Sasanid literati, to the early Safavid period was a novel phenomenon. This sequence of the dynastic history of *Irānzamin* was constructed for the first time by Qāżi Nāṣer-al-Din ʿOmar Bayżāwi (q.v.; d. 1316) in his concise (95 pages), yet significant and influential, history of Iran, *Neẓām al-tawārik* (The arrangement of history). Bayżāwi was a prominent figure in the religious wing of the Persian literati, who served as the chief justice (*qāżi al-qożāt*) of Fārs province in the early Il-khanid era and made a number of well-known contributions in Arabic to Islamic jurisprudence, Islamic philosophy, and Arabic grammar. His only work in Persian was his arrangement of the ethno-national history of Iran. In his own words, "I have connected the sequence of governors and kings of Iran—which extends from the Euphrates to the Oxus, or rather from the Arab lands to the borders of Khojand—from Adam to the present day. I have divided it into four parts and written it in Persian so that its benefits might be more widespread" (tr. in Melville, p. 76). As Charles Melville (p. 70) has suggested, Bayżāwi's rearrangement of Iran's history from ancient times to the Mongol era "had a rather clear political agenda" and that "he was supported by people at the highest level of the court."

Although a number of later historians, including Rašid-al-Din and Banākati, frequently cited *Neẓām al-tawārik* and adopted its reordering of Iran's history, it appears that Bayżāwi's rearrangement of Iran's ethno-national history into "four periods" was followed in a more systematic and substantively expanded version by Ḥamd-Allāh Mostawfi (q.v.; d. 1349) in his influential work *Tārik-e gozida*. Mostawfi elaborates on the dynasties that ruled Iran in four sections (*bāb*s): first, the pre-Islamic dynasties of the Pišdādids, the Kayānids, the Moluk

al-ṭawāyef (Arsacids), and the Sasanids; second, the
Umayyad rule in Iran; third, the Abbasid rule in Iran;
and fourth, the dynasties that ruled Iran since the early
Islamic era. These dynasties were: the Saffarids and the
Samanids, who ruled a part of Iran; the Ghaznavids, who
ruled most of Iran in their initial 30 years; the Ghurids;
the Daylamites and the Buyids; the Saljuqs, some of whom
ruled over all of Iran and some over only parts of Iran;
the Ḵʷārazmšāhs; the Atābakān (q.v.) of Fārs and Syria;
the Ismāʿilis of Iran and Egypt; the Qarāḵatāys of Ker-
mān; the Atābakān of Lorestān; and, finally, the Mongol
dynasty.

Table 1
PERIODIZATION OF IRAN'S HISTORY
FROM KAYOMARṮ TO MONGOLS

Main Periods	Bayżāwi[*]	Mostawfi[*]
1. Prophets	5	9
2. Kings of Persia, Pre-Islamic	38	9
3. The Prophet & Caliphs	18	40
4. Kings of Persia, Islamic era	39	42
Total percent	100	100
Total pages	95	606

*Percent of pages devoted to each period.

As Table 1 illustrates, Bayżāwi devotes over three-
fourths of his work to kings of Persia, whereas Mostawfi
allocates only one-half of his history to them. It is im-
portant to note that, although Mostawfi devotes a larger
portion of his history to the Umayyad and Abbasid
caliphs, he consciously covers them in terms of their
"rule in Iran" and not in the world of Islam in general:
moddat-e molkešān be Irān (p. 10). A unique feature of
the contributions of Bayżāwi and Mostawfi is their ex-
clusive focus on Iran's history from the creation of man
and society in Iran to the Mongol era, which sets their
work apart from Jovayni's *Jahāngošāy*, exclusively a
history of the Mongols, or Rašid-al-Din's *Jāmeʿ al-
tawāriḵ*, a comprehensive world history from its begin-
ning through the Mongol era.

The influence and popularity of both Bayżāwi's and
Mostawfi's rearrangement of the history of Iran is in-
dicated by the large number of surviving manuscripts of
their works from the 13th to the 19th centuries, 58 and 95
respectively (compared to other popular works such as
Banākati's with 31, Juzjāni's with 23, and Šabānkāraʾi's
with 13 surviving manuscripts). Of Bayżāwi's work, 27
copies were produced in the Safavid period and 14 during
the Qajar era (see Melville, Tables 1 and 2, pp. 73-74). It
seems plausible, therefore, that a proportionately large
number of manuscripts of Mostawfi's work may also have
been produced during the Safavid and Qajar periods. In-
deed, Mostawfi's influence seems to have surpassed that

of Bayżāwi's, as he is cited in later historical works more
frequently. For example, Mirḵʷānd in *Tāriḵ-e rawżat al-
ṣafā* refers to Mostawfi on 16 occasions and to Bayżāwi
in only 8 cases, and Ḵʷāndamir in *Ḥabib al-siar* refers
to Mostawfi on 56 occasions and to Bayżāwi on only 3
occasions.

It was through the popularity of these works that the
new, fourfold paradigm of Iran's history, which displays
a more ethno-nationalistic spirit, enjoyed a prolonged
success in Persian historiography in the ensuing cen-
turies. Another important feature of this mode of re-
construction of the dynastic history of Iran is a clear
geographical awareness of Iran or Irānzamin both in its
totality and its constituent parts, combining the historical
depth of the idea of "Iran" with its geographical breadth.

Mostawfi's significant contribution to the pre-modern
"ethno-national history of Iran" is supplemented by his
geography, *Nozhat al-qolub*. The latter work's impor-
tance derives from its treatment of the contemporary
geographical notion of Iran, as well as its boundaries and
provinces. Prefacing his work with a description of the
two holy sites of Mecca and Medina, outside of Iran's
boundaries, Mostawfi begins his treatment of Iran by dis-
cussing different views on the foundation of Iran by Iraj
(q.v.) and its place in the world's seven climes. He sug-
gests that all commentators (Greeks, Indians, and Per-
sians) agree that Iran, located at the center of the inhabited
world, is its best part, harking back to the old Sasanid
notion of Irānšahr. According to Mostawfi, the bound-
aries of Irānzamin stretch from the Sind river (in India)
to Ḵʷārazm and Transoxania in the east to Byzantium and
Syria in the west. Being aware of the depth and breadth
of the historical geography of Iran, Mostawfi reiterates
that he is treating only those outer lands that are located
on the frontiers of the kingdom of Iran, although "some,
at times, have been under the sway of the sovereigns of
Iran, and even in these parts some cities have been in
fact founded by the sovereigns of Iran" (tr. Le Strange,
pp. 23-24). Mostawfi describes the provinces of Iran in
20 chapters, beginning with Iraq (ʿErāq-e Arab) or "the
heart of Irānšahr," and ʿErāq-e ʿAjam (western provinces),
followed by Arrān and Muḡān, Šervān, Georgia, Byzan-
tium, Armenia, Rabiʿa, Kurdistan, Khuzestan, Fārs and
the Persian Gulf, Šabānkāra, Kermān, Mokrān and Hor-
muz, the province between Kermān and Qohestān (present
day Baluchistan), Nimruz, Khorasan, Māzandarān, Qumes
and Ṭabarestān, and finally, Jilānāt (Gilan). This mode of
conceptualizing Iran's history and geography has been
followed by other historians since the 13th century.

THE RISE OF "IRANIAN-SHIʿITE" IDENTITY
UNDER THE SAFAVIDS

Iran regained its political unity and was given a new
distinct religious identity under the Safavids. Shiʿism
became the official state religion and henceforth played
an important role in the reconstruction of a new ethno-
religious identity for the Iranian people. Furthermore,
the rise of the Safavid empire coincided with the rise
of the Ottoman empire in West Asia and North Africa,

the Mughal empire in India, and the Uzbek empire in Central Asia, all adhering to Sunnite Islam. The formation of these political entities helped create a distinct Iranian-Shiʿite political identity among these polities. It also helped to expand the hegemony of Persian language in much of the Islamic world. Persian literature was produced from Anatolia to Central Asia and the Indian subcontinent (see Golčin-Maʿāni, *Bā kārvān-e Hend*).

Under the Safavids, a number of important measures were taken to blend religious and ethno-national traditions, while closely following the historiography of the Mongol-Timurid era (for a survey of Safavid historiography and its connection with Timurids, see Quinn, 2000, pp. 28, 49-50, 52).

"Iran" in Safavid historiography. Ḡiāṯ-al-Din Ḵᵛāndamir (d. 1524), the first prominent Safavid historian, was one of the last historians of the Il-khanid-Timurid era and the grandson of Mir Moḥamamd Mirḵᵛānd, author of the influential history, *Rawżat al-ṣafā*. In preparing his general history, *Ḥabib al-siar fi aḵbār afrād al-bašar*, Ḵᵛāndamir followed the style of *Rawżat al-ṣafā* and that of such popular historical works as *Neẓām al-tawāriḵ* and *Tāriḵ-e gozida* (see above). The frequency of the usage of *Iran*, *Irānzamin* and related terms in the three volumes of *Ḥabib al-siar* (completed in 1524) reveals the evolution in the usage of these terms in the Islamic era. The frequency is relatively high in volume I, with 28 references to events of the pre-Islamic period; it drops sharply to 12 in volume II, treating the history of the Islamic period up to the Mongol era; and it leaps to 69 references in volume III, dealing with the Il-khanid-Timurid, and early Safavid periods. Other representative works of this period also make frequent references to "Iran," including *ʿĀlamārā-ye Šāh Esmāʿil*, *ʿĀlamārā-ye Šah Ṭahmāsp*, Ḥasan Beg Rumlu's (d. 1577) *Aḥsan al-tawāriḵ*, Ebn Karbalāʾi's (d. 1589) *Rawżat al-jenān*, Malekšāh Ḥosayn Sistāni's (d. 1619) *Eḥyāʾ al-moluk*, Mollā ʿAb-al-Nabi Faḵr-al-Zamāni's *Taḏkera-ye meyḵāna* (1619); Eskander Beg Rumlu's (d. 1629) *Aḥsan al-tawāriḵ*; Wāleh Eṣfahāni's (d. 1648) *Ḵold-e barin*, Naṣiri's (d. 1698) *Dastur-e šahriārān*.

Finally, Moḥammad Mofid Bāfqi (d. 1679), in addition to making numerous references to "Iran" and "ʿAjam" in his *Jāmeʿ-e Mofidi* (q.v.), refers to distinct borders of Iran and its neighbors, India, Turān, and Byzantium as well as the influx of people from those lands to Iran. In a number of cases, he describes the nostalgia of those Iranians who migrated to India but were later compelled to return by their love for their homeland (*ḥobb al-waṭan*; see below). He makes a number of insightful comments about Iranian identity and various features of the lands of Iran in his historical geography of Iran, *Moḵtaṣar-e Mofid*. Adopting the model of Mostawfi's *Nozhat al-qolub*, he makes some 20 references to *Iran*, *Irānzamin*, and *Irānšahr*, as well as the borders of Iran's territory, in the introduction to his work. He makes numerous references, furthermore, to Persian mythological and legendary figures in the traditional history of Iran as founders of a large number of cities in Yazd, Iraq,

Fārs, Azerbaijan, and other parts of Iran. Finally, he provides readers with a useful list of Iranian islands in the Persian Gulf and the Sea of Oman.

On average, on 62 occasions the term Iran and related concepts were used in each of the above historical works of the Safavid era.

It is also noteworthy that, from the beginnings of relations between Iran and the West in this period, the Iranian officials tended to consider their distinctive culture and civilization to be unique and superior to all others, including the Western countries (for a survey of the superiority trait among Iranians of the Safavid era, see Matthee, 1998).

Religion and ethno-national identity. Contrary to the views of those who deny the role of religion in the formation of ethno-national identities, it may be noted that in most European societies local churches played an important part in creating and maintaining a sense of national identity, particularly at times of social and political crisis. Eric Hobsbawm argues that, although religion may appear as a rival to nationalism in attracting people's loyalties, in actual fact it has acted as a catalyst for nationalism both in pre-modern and modern times. As examples of this process he cites the contributions made by Zoroastrianism in the formation of the Iranian ethno-national identification in the Sasanid era and the role played by Shiʿism at the time of the Safavids (Hobsbawm, pp. 69, 137). The evidence pointing to the symbiosis of Persian and Shiʿite traditions includes the use of combined Shiʿite and Iranian titles by the Safavid shahs, the dissemination of the genealogy for the Imams as maternal descendants of the last Sasanid king, invention of the tradition of *ḥobb al-waṭan menaʾl-imān*, and dissemination of various traditions attributed to the Imams providing religious legitimacy to the observance of the Persian New Year and its accompanying rites.

The Safavid kings called themselves, among other appellations, the "dog of the shrine of ʿAli" (*kalb-e āstān-e ʿAli*), while assuming the title of Šāhanšāh (the king of kings) of Iran. It must be remembered that the title of the king of Iran was also used by Āq Quyunlu rulers (the direct predecessors of the Safavids) who presented themselves as successors to the glorious mythical kings of ancient Persia (Faridun, Jamšid, and Kaykāvus). Even Ottoman sultans, when addressing the Āq Quyunlu and Safavid kings, used such titles as the "king of Iranian lands" or the "sultan of the lands of Iran" or "the king of kings of Iran, the lord of the Persians" or the "holders of the glory of Jamšid and the vision of Faridun and the wisdom of Dārā." They addressed Shah Esmaʿil as: "the king of Persian lands and the heir to Jamšid and Kayḵosrow" (Navāʾi, pp. 578, 700-702, 707). During Shah ʿAbbās's reign (q.v.) the transformation is complete and Shiʿite Iran comes to face the two adjacent Sunni powers: the Ottoman Empire to the west and the Kingdom of Uzbeks to the east.

The maternal Iranian origin of the Imams. With the spread of Shiʿism in Iran, the idea of the maternal linkage of the Imams with Sasanid stock (real or imagined) was

disseminated. The Persian Shiʿites are proud of the lineage of the Imams as maternal descendants of Yazdegerd III, the last Sasanid king. According to tradition, the fourth Shiʿite Imam (ʿAli b. Ḥosayn, Ḥażrat-e Sajjād), is reported to have said: "I am proud to descend from the lineage of my father, Imam Ḥosayn, coming from Qorayš, the noblest of Arab tribes, as I am of the lineage of my mother, princess Šahrbānu, descended from Persian stock, whom the Prophet himself called the noblest of non-Arab peoples" (Dehḵodā, III, p. 1537; Qomi, p. 196; Ebn al-Balḵi, p. 4). The marriage of the Persian princess with the third Imam has been described as having taken place at a dramatic audience of ʿOmar, the second caliph, at which a princess, the daughter of Yazdegerd III, is presented among the booties of the Arab army. At the critical moment when ʿOmar orders the selling of the princess into the slave market, Imam ʿAli appears on the scene and opposes the verdict on the grounds of a Prophetic tradition that forbids "the sale of the royal offspring in Islam." When Imam ʿAli prevails, he leaves her to the patronage of Salmān Fārsi (a legendary Persian companion of the Prophet) to arrange for her marriage to a man of her choice. Šahrbānu chooses to marry Imam Ḥosayn and gives birth to the fourth Shiʿite Imam. In this imaginary narrative, all Imams from the fourth to the twelfth (the Mahdi, the Lord of the Age) are maternal descendents of the last Sasanid king (see, ʿOnṣor-al-Maʿāli, Qābus-nāma, pp. 137-38). Considering that the Safavids had also invented a genealogy linking their lineage to the Imams, belief in this narrative also signifies the Persian genealogical roots of the Safavids.

The love of homeland. On a number of occasions in the Safavid period—apparently for the first time—the notion of *waṭan* and the love for it were extended from the love of birthplace and residence to Iran. Šafiʿi Kadkani argues, for example, that the Hadith *of ḥobb al-waṭan menaʾl-imān* might have been invented by Persians, who were more concerned with territorial ties, than Arabs, who were primarily identified with their lineage. Šafiʿi argues that Jāḥeẓ did not refer to the tradition in his comprehensive treatment of the subject, *al-Ḥanin elaʾl-awṭān*; it is rarely found in Sunnite Hadith collections; and the main references to it could be found in Moḥammad Bāqer Majlesi's *Beḥār al-anwār* and Shaikh ʿAbbās Qomi's *Safinat al-beḥār* (Šafiʿi Kadkani, p. 12). Moḥammad Mofid Bāfqi, a contemporary of Majlesi, in his *Jāmeʿ-e Mofidi* reports that when a prominent statesman, Mirzā Moḥammad Amin, had been serving as the vizier of the Qotbshahids of Deccan (q.v), he became nostalgic and returned to Iran for the love of his homeland (*ḥobb-e waṭan and ārezu-ye āmadan-e be Irān*). Other examples include a certain Mirzā Esḥāq Beg and Captain Āqā Aḥmad, who migrated to India and later returned to Iran, or that of Mofid himself, who decided to return to Iran from India in accordance with the Hadith of *ḥobb al-waṭan menaʾl-imān*, in spite of the comfort and hospitality extended to him in Šāh Jahānābād (*Jāmeʿ . . .* , III, 1, pp. 92, 453, 475, 804). Still another case is the poet, Nawʿi Ḵabušāni (d.

1610), who, becoming nostalgic during his long residence in the court of the Indian king, Akbar, laments in a moving poem that "my tears flow to cleanse the land of Iran" (cited in Šafiʿ Kadkani, p. 5).

Commemorations of Nowruz and ʿĀšurā. Commemorations of historic events in pre-modern societies served as the central vehicle for connecting collective memory with ethnic or ethno-national identification. Placing commemorations of seminal cultural events in their historical setting is an indication that the two distinct yet related ethno-national and religious events, *Nowruz* and *ʿĀšurā* (celebrations of New Year's day for 13 days and the martyrdom of Imam Ḥosayn, the third Shiʿite Imam, for 10 days), are of utmost significance in the reconstruction of Iranian identity under the Safavids. Initiated in Baghdad in the year 963 by order of the Buyid ruler, Moʿezz-al-Dawla, the commemoration of ʿĀšurā (q.v.) was added to the celebrations of *Nowruz* and *Mehragān*. When Āšurā coincided with the other two celebrations, the ethno-national festivals were observed on the next day; this scenario occurred in the year 398/1008, when Āšurā coincided with Mehragān (see Faqihi, pp. 466-67). These dual commemorations became well established under the Safavids and together laid the foundations for the "Iranian-Shiʿite" identity for over 500 years.

The commemoration of the martyrdom of Imam Ḥosayn has many similarities to that of the martyrdom of Siāvuš (*Sug-e Siāvuš*) in pre-Islamic Persian mythology, which was commemorated in Soghdiana and Chorasmia until the early Islamic era and in some villages in Kuhgiluya even until recent times. Given that the two rites display a number of basic common features, some writers have suggested that ʿĀšurā may have gradually substituted the mourning for Siāvuš over time (see Meskoob, *Sug-e Siāvuš*, pp. 80-89). In fact, the similarities of the two commemorations may partially explain the pervasive popularity of Āšurā among Persians. As Yarshater (1979, pp. 88-94) concludes in his comparison of the two rituals: "The martyrdom of Hussein and his kin found a ready ground in Persian tradition in order to develop into an inspiring and elaborate mourning drama. It inherited the major feature of a long-standing practice which had deep roots in the Persian soul."

While Āšurā inherited basic features of the ritual of Siāvuš, Nowruz found religious legitimization by invention of a number of traditions attributed to Shiʿite Imams from the Buyid to the Safavid periods. The historical narratives concerning the celebration of Nowruz indicate that, despite the objection of zealous Islamic universalists, Persians at large continued to celebrate Nowruz from the advent of Islam to the present time. The length, the joyful collective mood, and the grandeur of Nowruz celebrations in Iran and many parts of Central Asia is unparalleled in comparison to all of the religious and ethno-national festivals in other Islamic societies (see ČAHĀRŠANBASURI; HAFTSIN; NOWRUZ ii. ISLAMIC PERIOD).

The contested, yet mutually supportive nature of the two distinct commemorations of Nowruz and ʿĀšurā has made observance of the Persian New Year the subject of

longstanding controversy in Shʿite jurisprudence. This controversy between those who espouse Nowruz's legitimacy and those who condemn it as a pagan and un-Islamic practice in Iran may be traced to the Buyid period. When Shiʿism was formally declared the state religion under the Safavids and the observance of both Nowruz and ʿĀšurā formed the two major wings of state festivals, a revised and expanded version of the book on Nowruz and the Persian calendar was prepared and incorporated (as a volume of some 90 pages in a set of 110 volumes) into the encyclopedic collection of Shiʿite traditions, *Behār al-anwār* by Mollā Moḥammd Bāqer Majlesi, the major religious figure in the Safavid state. Of various traditions presented in *Behār al-anwār* on the celebration of Nowruz, two stand out as of central importance: one attributed to Imam Jaʿfar al-Ṣādeq (q.v.), sanctifying the celebration, and the other attributed to Imam Musā al-Kāẓem, condemning it as un-Islamic. *Behār* narrates the story of a certain Moʿallā b. Ḵonays, who pays a visit to Imam Ṣādeq on Nowruz. Explaining the significance of Nowruz, as "the day of the primal covenant with mankind, the day of the first rising of the sun, and the day of various other events in the lives of the prophets concluding with the defeat of the antichrist Dajjāl by the Qāʾem," the Imam maintains that it is "one of our days [i.e., holy days] and one of the days of our Shiʿa, which the Persians have kept, although you [presumably the Arabs] have tried to suppress it" (Majlesi, *Behār al-anwār* LIX, p. 92, as tr. and cited by Walbridge, p. 83). The adversaries of Nowruz rely on a tradition attributed to Imam Musā al-Kāẓem, when the Caliph al-Manṣur called upon him regarding the legitimacy of the observance of Nowruz, and he replied: "I have examined the traditions of my grandfather, the Messenger of God, and found nothing about this holiday. It is a Persian custom that Islam has destroyed" (*Behār*, loc. cit., as tr. and cited by Walbridge, p. 83). While suggesting that this tradition has been frequently attributed to Imam al-Ṣādeq in numerous sources, Majlesi, in a scholarly manner, leaves the door open for the readers to decide the issue for themselves. Also of importance in the controversy is the fact that, since the time of Shaikh al-Ṭāʾefa Ṭusi, one of the founding fathers of Shiʿite law in the 11th century, the obligatory fast and prayer of Nowruz has become a part of Shiʿite law, but the date of Nowruz has been the subject of continued controversy. Furthermore, Shaikh ʿAbbās Qomi, in his influential modern collection of Shiʿite prayers, *Mafātiḥ al-jenān*, talks in support of the tradition attributed to Imam al-Ṣādeq to sanctify the celebration of Nowruz: "On the day of Nowruz wash [perform ablution] and dress in your cleanest clothes . . ." (as cited by Walbridge, pp. 89-90). The pervasive celebration of Nowruz among people from all walks of life may also be observed by comparing it to the other main Islamic festivals, with the exception of Āšura. The celebration of Nowruz surpasses the two main Islamic festivals: the festival of fast-breaking (ʿId-e Feṭr), during the holiday that follows the completion of the holy month of fasting (Ramażān), and the festival of sacrifice (ʿId-e Qorbān or al-Ażḥā).

The significance of Nowruz is further indicated by its special place in the chronicles of Safavid historians, featuring detailed descriptions of the grandeur of Nowruz festivities, even when it coincided with ʿĀšurā. Nowruz festivities on 21 March 1611 occurred on Friday, 6 Moḥarram 1020, the day on which Shiʿites commemorate the martyrdom of Imam Ḥosayn. Shah ʿAbbās honored both days, mourning on the day of ʿĀšurā and celebrating Nowruz on the following day. The grandeur of the celebration of Nowruz 1611 is well illustrated in the chronicle *Āla-mārā-ye ʿAbbāsi*: "The Shah then ordered a great feast to be prepared in the Bāḡ-e Naqš-e Jahān to which all classes of society were invited. . . . Each group was allotted its own particular place in the park, and gold tents and canopies of silk and Chinese brocade were set up. Booths, embellished in curious remarkable ways and illuminated with lamps, were erected in front of each group. Pages plied the assembled gathering with cheering draughts, and the merrymaking went on for several days" (tr. Savory, 1978, p. 1037).

CONCLUSION

Transcending local, regional, as well as kinship and tribal horizons, a relatively coherent historical and cultural conception of Iranian identity was developed in the long pre-modern history of Iran. The identity of Iranians was largely drawn from their territorial ties. They were identified, for the most part, with their places of birth or residence, which were in turn located in the lands of Iran or kingdom of Iran (*irānšahr*, *irānzamin*, *molk-e Irān*, *mamlekat-e Irān*, *kešvar-e Irān*). They assumed that their ties to the historical conception of the lands of Iran were also manifestations of their common imagined ancestry, deeply rooted in Persian mythologies and traditional history. Even the Persianized ruling Turkic and Mongol men of the sword presented themselves as the heirs of Persian kings and *amir*s in a continuum from primordial times to the end of the Qajar period, and as such they were considered to be Iranian. Belief in Iran's cultural distinctiveness, commemoration of the national festival of Nowruz, dissemination of the idea of "Iran" through *naqqāli* and *Šāh-nāma ḵ'āni* to the masses, and the popularity of Persian poetry among people from all walks of life continued to serve as the foundation of Iranian cultural identity in modern times.

It is interesting to note that the glorification of pre-Islamic Iranian history and culture recurred in the Safavid period, with many imaginative linguistic inventions, with the Āḏar Keyvāni religious and literary movement (q.v.), a pseudo-Zoroastrian sect (see also DABESTĀN-E MAḎĀHEB; DASĀTIR; for its influence during the 19th century, see Tavakoli-Targhi, 2001, pp. 86-95). Following this movement in the 19th century, a Qajar prince, Jalāl-al-Din Mirzā, identifying himself as being of Persian stock, prepared the first textbook of Iran's pre-modern ethno-national history from the time of creation to the mid-19th century. It was within this broad framework of historical awareness and cultural consciousness that Iranian identity entered the age of nationalism of the 19th and 20th centuries (see iv, below).

Bibliography: ʿAbd-al-Razzāq Samarqandi, *Maṭlaʿ-e saʿdayn wa majmaʿ-e baḥrayn* I, ed. ʿA.-Ḥ. Navāʾi, Tehran, 1974. Salih Said Agha, *Revolution which Toppled the Umayyads: Neither Arab nor Abbasid*, Leiden, 2003. *ʿĀlamārā-ye Šāh Esmāʿil*, ed. ʿA. Montaẓer-e Ṣāḥeb, Tehran, 1970. *ʿĀlamārā-ye Šāh Ṭahmāsb*, ed. I. Afšār, Tehran, 1991. H. F. Amedroz, "The Assumption of the Title of Shahanshah by the Buwayid Rulers," *Numismatic Chronicle*, 4th series, 5, 1905, pp. 393-99. Amir Moʿezzi, *Divān-e Amir Moʿezzi*, ed. ʿA. Eqbāl-Āštiāni, Tehran, 1939. A. J. Arberry, "Persian Literature," in idem, ed., *The Legacy of Persia*, London, 1968, pp. 199-292. Ahmad Ashraf, "Boḥrān-e howiyat-e melli wa qawmi dar Irān" (The crisis of national and ethnic identities in Iran), in *Iran Nameh/Irān-nāma* 12/3, Summer 1994, pp. 521-50. H. W. Baily, *Zoroastrian Problems in the Ninth-Century Books*, Oxford, 1943. Abu ʿAli Moḥamamd Balʿami, *Tāriḵ-e Balʿami*, ed. M.-T. Bahār, Tehran, 1962. Faḵr-al-Din Dāʾud Banākati, *Tāriḵ-e Banākati, rawżat ola'l-albāb fi maʿrefat al-tawāriḵ wa'l-ansāb*, ed. J. Šeʿār, Tehran, 1969. Qāżi Nāṣer-al-Din ʿOmar Bayżāwi, *Neẓām al-tawāriḵ*, ed. Šams-Allāh Qadri, Hyderabad, 1930; ed. B. Karimi, Tehran, 1936. Abu Rayḥān Biruni, *Ketāb al-āṯār al-bāqia ʿan al-qorun al-ḵālia*, ed. Eduard Sachau as *Chronologie orientalischer Völker von Albêrûnî*, Leipzig, 1878; several reprints. François de Blois, "A Persian Poem Lamenting the Arab Conquest," in C. Hillenbrand, ed., *Studies in Honor of Clifford Edmund Bosworth* II, Leiden, 2000, pp. 82-95. Bondāri Eṣfahāni, *Tāriḵ-e selsela-ye Saljuqi: zobdat al-noṣra wa noḵbat al-ʿoṣra*, tr. M.-Ḥ. Jalili, Tehran, 1977. C. E. Bosworth, "The Heritage of Rulership in Early Islamic Iran and the Search for Dynastic Connections with the Past," *Iran* 11, 1973, pp. 51-62. John A. Boyle, "The Evolution of Iran as a National State," *Acta Iranica* 3, 1974, pp. 327-38. E. G. Browne, *A Literary History of Persia*, 4 vols., Cambridge, 1956. Claude Cahen, "Tribes, Cities, and Social Organization," in *Camb. Hist. Iran* IV, pp. 305-28. Sayyed Moḥamamad Dabirsiāqi, "Tāt o Tājik o Tāzik," in I. Afšār, ed., *Nāmvāra-ye Doktor Maḥmud Afšār* VI, Tehran, 1991, pp. 3374-421. Elton L. Daniel, "Manuscripts and Editions of Balʿami's Tarjomah-i Tārīḵ-i Ṭabari," *JRAS*, 1990, pp. 282-321. ʿAli-Akbar Dehḵodā, *Amṯāl o ḥekam*, 4 vols., Tehran 1959-60. Abu Ḥanifa Dinavari, *al-Aḵbār al-ṭewāl*, ed. Vladimir Guirgass, Leiden, 1888. Ebn al-Balḵi, *Fārs-nāma*, ed. Guy Le Strange and R. A. Nicholson as *The Fársnáma of Ibnu'l-Balkhí*, GMS, Cambridge, 1921. Ebn Beṭriq (Eutychius), *Annales*, ed. L. Cheikho, Beirut, 1906-09. Ebn Esfandiār, *Tāriḵ-e Ṭabarestān*, tr. E. G. Browne as *An Abridged Translation of the History of Tabaristan*, Leiden and London, 1905; ed. ʿA. Eqbāl-Āštiāni, 2 vols., Tehran, 1941. Ebn Ḵordāḏbeh, *Ketāb al-masālek wa'l-mamālek*, ed. M. J. de Goeje, BGA, Leiden, 1889; 2nd ed., Leiden, 1967. Ebn Meskawayh, *Tahḏīb al-aḵlāq*, ed. C. Zurayk, Beirut, 1966, tr. C. Zurayk as *The Refinement of Character*, Beirut, 1968. Ebn al-Nadim, *Ktāb al-fehrest*, ed.

R. Tajaddod, Tehran, 1971. Ebn Qoṭayba, *al-Maʿāref*, ed. Ṯarwat ʿOkāša, Cairo, 1960. Idem, *ʿOyun al-aḵbār*, ed. A. Zaki ʿAdawi, 4 vols., Cairo, 1925-30. Moʿin-al-Din Esfazāri, *Rawżāt al-jannāt fi awṣāf madinat al-Herāt* I, ed. M. Esḥāq, Calcutta, 1961. Eskandar Beyg Torkamān, *Tārik-e ʿālamāra-ye ʿabbāsi*, 2 vols., ed. I. Afšār, Tehran, 1955-56; tr. Roger Savory as as *History of Shah ʿAbbas the Great*, Boulder, Colo., 1978. Estaḵri, *Masālek wa mamālek*, Tehran, 1961.

Mollā ʿAbd-al-ʿAli Faḵr-al-Zamāni, *Taḏkera-ye meyḵāna*, ed. A. Golčin-e Maʿāni, Tehran, 1961. ʿAli-Aṣḡar Faqihi, *Āl-e Buya wa awżāʿ-e zamān-e išān*, Tehran, 1978. Sayf-al-Din Moḥammad Farḡāni, *Divān-e Sayf-al-Din Moḥammad Farḡāni* I, ed. Ḏ. Ṣafā, Tehran, 1962. Farroḵi Sistāni, *Divān-e Farroḵi-e Sistāni*, ed. M. Dabirsiāqi, Tehran, 1976. Ferdowsi, *Šāh-nāma*, ed. Djalal Khaleghi-Motlagh, Bib. Pers., Persian Text Series, N.S. 1, New York, 1987-. Bert Fragner, *Die "Persophonie": Regionalität, Identität und Sprachkontakt in der Geschichte Asiens* (Persophonia—regionalism, identity, and language contacts in the history of Asia), Halle an der Saale, 1999. Richard Frye, *The Golden Age of Persia*, London, 1975. ʿAbd al-Ḥayy Gardizi, *Zayn al-aḵbār*, ed. ʿAbd-al-Ḥayy Ḥabibi, Tehran, 1968. H. A. R. Gibbs, "The Social Significance of the Shuubiya," in *Studia Orientalia Ioanni Pedersen Dicata*, Copenhagen, 1953, pp. 105-14; repr. in idem, *Studies on the Civilization of Islam*, Princeton, 1962, pp. 62-73. Gherardo Gnoli, *The Idea of Iran: An Essay on Its Origin*, Rome, 1989. Aḥmad Golčin-e Maʿāni, *Kārvān-e Hend: dar aḥwāl o āṯār-e šāʿerān-e ʿaṣr-e Ṣafawi ke be Hend raftand*, 2 vols., Mašhad, 1990. Ignaz Goldziher, *Muhammedanische Studien* I, Halle, 1889; ed. S. M. Stern, tr., C. M. Barber and S. M. Stern, as *Muslim Studies* I, London, 1966. Asʿad Gorgāni, *Vis o Rāmin*, ed. M. Minovi, Tehran, 1958. G. E. von Grunebaum, "Firdausi's Concept of History," in idem, *Islam, Essays in the Nature and Growth of a Cultural Tradition*, London, 1961, pp. 168-84. Dimitri Gutas, *Greek Thought, Arabic Culture*, London, 1998. Ḥāfeẓ-e Abru, *Zobdat al-tawāriḵ* I, ed. K. Ḥājj Sayyed-jawādi, Tehran, 1993. Idem, *Joḡrāfiā-ye Ḥāfeẓ-e Abru*, 3 vols., ed. S. Sajjādi, Tehran, 1996-99. Ḥamd-Allāh Mostawfi, *Nozhat al-qolub*, ed. M. Dabirsiāqi, Tehran, 1957. Idem, *Tāriḵ-e gozida*, ed. ʿAbd-al-Ḥosayn Navāʾi, Tehran, 1960. Ḥamza Eṣfahāni, *Ketāb taʾriḵ seni moluk al-arż wa'l-anbiāʾ*, ed. and Latin tr. J.-M.-E. Gottwaldt, 2 vols., St. Petersburg and Leipzig, 1844-48. William Hanaway, "Alexander and the Question of Iranian Identity," *Acta Iranica* 16, 1991, pp. 93-103. J. Brian Harley and David Woodward, eds., *Cartography in the Traditional Islamic and South Asian Societies* II/1 *Islamic Cartography*, Madison, 1992. Eric Hobsbawm, *Nations and Nationalism Since 1780: Programme, Myth, Reality*, Cambridge, 1990. Jalāl Homāʾi, *Šoʿubiya*, ed. M. Qodsi, Isfahan, 1984. ʿAṭā-Malek Jovayni, *Tāriḵ-e jahāngošāy* I, ed. M. Qazvini, Leiden, 1911. Menhāj-e Serāj Juzjāni, *Tabaqāt-e nāṣeri*, ed. ʿA. Ḥabibi, Kabul, 1963. Ḡiāṯ-al-Din Ḵʷāndamir, *Tāriḵ*

ḥabib al-siar, ed. M. Dabirsiāqi, 4 vols., Tehran, 1954. Firoozeh Kashani-Sabet, *Frontier Fictions: Shaping the Iranian Nation*, *1804-1946*, Princeton, 1999. Carla Klausner, *The Seljuk Vizierate: A Study of Civil Administration 1055-1194*, Cambridge, Mass., 1973. Dorothea Krawulsky, *Īrān—Das Reich der Īlḫāne: Eine topographisch—historiche Studie*, Weisbaden, 1978. Ann K. S. Lambton, "Ḵawmiyya iii. in Persia," in *EI*² IV, 1978, pp. 785-90. Idem, "The Internal Structure of the Saljuq Empire," in *Theory and Practice in Medieval Persian Government*, London, 1980, pp. 203-82. Idem, *Qajar Persia: Eleven Studies*, Austin, 1987. Gilbert Lazard, "The Rise of the New Persian Language," *Camb. Hist. Iran* IV, 1975, pp. 595-632. G. Lecomte, *Ibn Qutayba: l'homme*, *son œuvre*, *ses idées*, Damascus, 1965. R. Levy, "Persia and the Arabs," in A. J. Arberry, ed., *The Legacy of Persia*, London, 1968, pp. 60-88.

Wilfred, Madelung, "The Assumption of the Title Shahanshah by the Buyids and the 'Reign of the Daylam' (Dawlat al-Daylam)," *JNES* 28, 1969, pp. 168-83. Moḥammad Bāqer Majlesi, *Behār al-anwār* LIX ed. Jawād ʿAlawi and M. Āḵundi, Tehran, 1949. Malekšāh Ḥosayn Sistāni, *Eḥyāʾ al-moluk*, ed. M. Sotudha, Tehran, 1965. Moṭahhar b. Ṭāher Maqdesi, *Ketāb al-badʾ waʾl-taʾriḵ*, ed. and tr. Clément Huart as *Le livre de la création et de l'histoire*, 6 vols., Paris, 1899-1919; Persian tr. M.-R. Šafiʿi Kadkani, as *Āfarineš wa tāriḵ*, 6 vols. in 2, Tehran, 1975. Moḥammad-Ḵalil Marʿaši Ṣafawi, *Majmaʿ al-tawāriḵ*, ed. ʿA. Eqbāl-Āštiāni, Tehran, 1950. Masʿudi, *Moruj al-ḏahab*, ed. and tr. Charles Barbier de Meynard and Abel Pavet de Courteille as *Les prairies d'or*, 9 vols., Paris, 1861-1917; rev. ed. Charles Pellat, 7 vols., Beirut, 1962-79. Idem, *Ketāb al-tanbih waʾl-ešrāf*, ed. M. J. de Goeje, BGA, Leiden, 1894. Jalāl Matini, "Iran dar goḏašt-e ruzgārān: dawrān-e eslāmi," *Iranshenasi/Irān-šenāsi* 4/2, 1992, pp. 243-68. Rudi Matthee, "Between Aloofness and Fascination: Safavid Views of the West," *Iranian Studies* 31/2, 1998, pp. 219-46. Julie Meisami, *Persian Historiography to the End of the Twelfth Century*, Edinburgh, 1999. Idem, "Why Write History in Persian? Historical Writings of the Samanid Period," in C. Hillenbrand, ed., *Studies in Honour of Clifford Edmund Bosworth* II, Leiden, 2000. Charles Melville, "From Adam to Abaqa: Qāḍi Baiḍāwī's Rearrangement of History," in *Studia Iranica* 30, 2001, pp. 67-86. Shahrokh Meskoob, *Sug-e Siāvuš* (*dar marg o rastāḵiz*), Tehran, 1971. Idem, *Iranian Nationality and the Persian Language*, tr. M. Hillmann, ed. J. Perry, Foreword and Interview with the Author by Ali Banuazizi, Washington, D.C., 1992. Vladimir Minorsky, "Persia: Religion and History," in G. E. von Grunebaum, ed., *Unity and Variety in Muslim Civilization*, Chicago, 1955, pp. 173-90; repr. in V. Minorsky, *Iranica: Twenty Articles*, *Bist maqāla-ye Minorski*, Tehran, 1964, pp. 242-59. Idem, "The Older Preface to the Shahnama," ibid., pp. 260-73. Idem, "The Iranian Intermezzo," in *Studies in Caucasus History*, London, 1953, pp. 110-16. Moḥammad Ḵᵛāvandšāh Mirḵᵛānd, *Tāriḵ-e rawżat al-ṣafā* XI,

ed. M.-J. Maškur, Tehran, 1972. Moḥammad Mofid Mostawfi Bāfqi Yazdi, *Jāmeʿ-e mofidi*, vols. 1 and 3, ed. I. Afšār, Tehran, 1961-63. Idem, *Moḵtaṣar-e Mofid dar aḥwāl-e belād-e welāyāt-e Irān*, ed. Seyfeddin Najmabadi, Wiesbaden, 1989. M. Moḥammadi Malāyeri, *Tāriḵ wa farhang-e Irān dar dawrān-e enteqāl az ʿaṣr-e Sāsāni be ʿaṣr-e eslāmi*, 5 vols., Tehran, 1993-2003. M. Moʿin, *Mazdayasnā wa adab-e fārsi* I, 3rd ed., Tehran, 1976. *Mojmal al-tawāriḵ waʾl-qeṣaṣ*, ed. M.-T. Bahār, Tehran, 1939. David Morgan, *Medieval Persia*, *1040-1797*, London, 1988. Roy P. Mottahedeh, "The Shuʿubiyah Controversy and the Social History of Early Islamic Iran," *IJMES* 7, 1976, pp. 161-82. Moḥammad b. Hendūšāh Naḵjavāni, *Dastur al-kāteb fī taʿyin al-marāteb*, ed. A. ʿAlīzāda, 3 vols. Moscow, 1964-76. Idem, *Tajāreb al-salaf*, ed. ʿA. Eqbāl-Āštiāni, Tehran, 1965. Naršaki, *Tārik-e Boḵārā*, ed. M.-T. Modarres Rażawi, Tehran, 1940; 2nd ed. Tehran, 1972; tr. R. N. Frye as *The History of Bukhara*, Cambridge, Mass., 1954. Šehāb-al-Din Nasavi, *Sirat-e Jalāl-al-Din Minkoberni*, ed. M. Minovi, Tehran, 1965. Moḥammad-Ebrāhim Naṣiri, *Dastur-e šahriārān*, ed. Moḥammad-Nāder Naṣiri Moqaddam, Tehran, 1994. ʿAbd-al-Ḥosayn Navāʾi, ed. *Asnād wa mokātabāt-e tāriḵi-e Irān az Timur tā Šāh Esmāʿil*, Tehran, 1977. *Nehāyat al-erab*, abr. tr. E. G. Browne, *JRAS*, 1900, pp. 195-259. Neẓām-al-Molk, *Siar al-moluk* (*Siāsat-nāma*), ed. Hubert Darke, Tehran, 1976; tr. Darke as *Siasat-Namah. The Book of Government or Rules for Kings*, London, 1960. ʿOnṣor-al-Maʿāli Kaykāvus b. Eskandar, *Qābus-nāma*, ed. Ḡ.-H. Yusofi, Tehran, 1966. ʿOnṣori, *Divān-e ʿOnṣori*, ed. M. Dabirsiāqi, Tehran, 1963. ʿOnṣor-al-Maʿāli Kaykāvus b. Eskandar, M. Qazvini, "Moqaddama-ye qadim-e Šāh-nāma," in idem, *Bist maqāla-ye Qazvini*, ed. ʿA. Eqbāl-Āštiāni, Tehran, 1953, II, pp. 5-90. Ḥasan b. Moḥammad Qomi, *Tāriḵ-e Qom*, ed. Jalāl-al-Din Ṭehrāni, Tehran, 1934. Shaikh ʿAbbās Qomi, *Mafātiḥ al-jenān*, Tabriz, 1908 (various printings). Sholeh A. Quinn, *Historical Writing During the Reign of Shah ʿAbbas: Ideology*, *Imitation*, *and Legitimacy in Safavid Chronicles*, Salt Lake City, 2000.

Rašid-al-Din Fażl-Allāh, *Tāriḵ-e mobārak-e Ḡazān Khan*, ed. Karl Jahn, London, 1940. Idem, *Jāmeʿ al-tawāriḵ* III, ed. ʿA.-ʿA. ʿAlizāda, Baku, 1957. Idem, *Sawāneḥ al-afkār-e rašidi*, ed. M.-T. Dānešpažuh, Tehran, 1979. Moḥammad b. ʿAli Rāvandi, *Rāḥat al-ṣodur wa āyat al-sorur dar tāriḵ-e Āl-e Saljuq*, ed. M. Eqbāl, new ed. with notes and references, M. Minovi, Tehran, 1985. Mohammad Rekaya, "La Place des provinces sud-caspiennes dans l'histoire de l'Iran . . . : particularisme regionale ou role 'nationale'?" *Revista degli studi orientali* 68, 1974, pp. 115-52. Idem, "Mazyar, resistance ou integration d'une province iranienne au monde musulman . . . ," *Studia Iranica* 2/2, 1973, pp. 143-92. Lutz Richter-Bernburg, "Linguistic Shuʿūbīya and Early Neo-Persian Prose," *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 94/1, 1974, pp. 55-64. Ḥasan Beyg Rumlu, *Aḥsan al-tawārik*, ed., ʿA.-Ḥ. Navāʾi. Tehran, 1978. Moḥammad b. ʿAli Šabānkāraʾi, *Majmaʿ al-ansāb*,

ed. M. H. Moḥaddeṯ, Tehran, 1984. Saʿdi, *Kolliyāt-e Saʿdi*, ed. M-ʿA. Foruḡi, Tehran, 1983. G.-H. Sadighi, *Les mouvements religieux iraniens au IIe et au IIIe siècle de l'hégire*, Paris, 1938; Persian tr. by the author as *Jonbešhā-ye dini-e Irāni dar qarnhā-ye dovvom wa sevvom-e hejri*, Tehran, 1993. Ḏabiḥ-Allāh Ṣafā, *Tāriḵ-e adabiyāt dar Irān*, 6 vols. in 9, Tehran, 1953-92. Idem, *Ḵolāṣa-ye tāriḵ-e siāsi, ejtemāʿi wa farhangi-e Irān az āḡāz tā pāyān-e ʿaṣr-e Ṣafawi*, Tehran, 1977. Idem, *Ḥemāsa-sarāyi dar Irān*, Tehran, 1984. Moḥammad-Reżā Šafiʿi Kadkani, "Talaqqi-e qodamāʾ az waṭan," *Alefbā* 2, 1973, pp. 1-26. Żiāʾ-al-Din Sajjādi, "Nām-e Irān dar naḵostin ašʿār-e fārsi," in I. Afšār, ed., *Nāmvāra-ye Doktor Maḥmud Afšār* II, Tehran, 1986, pp. 248-59. Bertold Spuler, *Iran in früh-islamischer Zeit; Politik, Kultur, Verwaltung und öffentliches Leben zwischen der arabischen und der seldschukischen Eroberung*, Wiesbaden, 1952; tr. J. Falāṭuri, as *Tāriḵ-e Irān dar qorun-e naḵostin-e eslāmi*, Tehran, 1970. Idem, "Iran: The Persistent Heritage," in G. E. von Grunebaum, ed., *Unity and Variety in Muslim Civilization*, Chicago, 1955, pp. 67–82. Idem, "The Evolution of Persian Historiography," in B. Lewis, P. M. Holt, eds., *Historians of the Middle East*, London, 1962. pp. 126-32. S. M. Stern, "Yaʾqub the Coppersmith and Persian National Sentiment," in C. E. Bosworth, ed., *Iran and Islam: In Memory of the Late Vladimir Minorsky*, Edinburgh, 1971, pp. 535-56. Idem, *Aristotle on the World State*, London, 1968. Abu Manṣur Ṯaʿālebi, *Ḡorar aḵbār moluk al-fors*, ed. and tr. Hermann Zotenberg as *Histoire des rois des Perses*, Paris, 1900. Moḥammad b. Jarir Ṭabari, *Ketāb taʾriḵ al-rosol waʾl-moluk*, ed. M. J. de Goeje et al., 15 vols., Leiden, 1879-1901; repr. Leiden, 1964; tr. by various scholars as *The History of al-Ṭabarī*, ed. Ehsan Yarshater, Albany, N.Y., 1985-. Idem, *Tarjoma-ye tafsir-e Ṭabari* I, ed. Ḥabib Yaḡmāʾi, Tehran, 1960. Aḥmad Tafażżoli, *Tāriḵ-e adabiyāt-e Irān-e piš az Eslām*, ed. Ž. Āmuzgār, Tehran, 1997. Idem, *Sasanian Society: I. Warriors, II, Scribes, III. Dehqāns*, New York, 2000. Tāj-al-Din Ḥasan b. Šehāb Yazdi, *Jāmeʿ al-tawāriḵ-e ḥasani, baḵš-e Timuriān pas as Timur (855-57)*, ed. Ḥ. Modarresi Ṭabāṭabāʾi and I. Afšār, Karachi, 1977. S. Ḥ. Taqizādeh, "Manšaʾ-e aṣli wa qadim-e Šāh-nāma," *Kāveh* 5/10, October 1920, pp. 9-14; repr. in *Hezāra-ye Ferdowsi*, Tehran, 1943, pp. 17-107. *Tāriḵ-e Sistān*, ed. M.-T. Bahār, Tehran, 1956; tr. Milton Gold as *The Tārikh-e Sistān*, PHS, Rome, 1976. Mohamad Tavakoli-Targhi, *Refashioning Iran: Orientalism, Occidentalism and Historiography*, New York, 2001. Mostafa Vaziri, *Iran as Imagined Nation: The Construction of National Identity*, New York, 1993. Moḥammad Yusof Wāleh Eṣfahāni, *Ḵold-e barin: Irān dar ruzgār-e Safawiān*, ed. Mir Hāšem Moḥaddeṯ, Tehran, 1972. John Walbridge, "A Persian Gulf in the Sea of Lights: The Chapter on Nawruz in the Bihār al-Anwār," *Iran* 35, 1997, pp. 83-92. G. M. Wickens, "Persian Literature; and Affirmation of Identity," in Roger M. Savory, ed., *Introduction to Islamic Civiliza-tion*, Cambridge, 1976. pp. 71-78. Aḥmad b. Abi Yaʿqub Yaʿqubi, *Ketāb al-boldān*, ed. M. J. de Goeje, BGA, Leiden, 1892; 2nd ed., Leiden, 1967. Idem, *Taʾriḵ*, ed. M. T. Houtsma as *Historiae*, Leiden, 1883. Yāqūt, *Eršad al-arib elā maʿrefat al-adib*, ed. D. S. Margoliouth, GMS, 7 vols., Leiden, 1907-26. Ehsan Yarshater, "Were the Sasanians Heirs to the Achaemenids?" in *La Persia nel Medioevo*, Rome, 1971, pp. 517-31. Idem, "Safavid Literature: Progress or Decline," *Iranian Studies* 7/1-2, 1974, pp. 217-70. Idem, "Taʿzia and Pre-Islamic Mourning Rites in Iran," in Peter Chelkowski, ed., *Taʿzieh Ritual and Drama in Iran*, New York, 1979, pp. 88-94. Idem, "Iranian National History," in *Camb. Hist. Iran* III/1, 1983a, pp. 359-477 (with extensive bibliography). Idem, "Mazdakism" in *Camb. Hist. Iran* III/1, 1983b, pp. 991-1024. Idem, "Čerā dar *Šāh-nāma* az pādšāhān-e Mād wa Haḵāmaneši ḏekr-i nist?" *Iran Nameh/Irān-nāma* 3/2, 1984, pp. 191-213. Idem, "The Persian Presence in Islamic World," in R. Hovannesian and G. Sabagh, eds., *The Persian Presence in Islamic World*, Cambridge, 1998, pp. 4-125. Ẓahir-al-Din Marʿaši, *Tāriḵ-e Ṭabarestān wa Ruyān wa Māzandarān*, introd. M.-J. Maškur, ed. M.-Ḥ Tasbiḥi, Tehran, 1966. Moḥamad b.ʿAli Ẓahiri Kāteb Samarqandi, *Aḡrāż al-siāsa fī aʿrāż al-riāsa*, ed. J. Šeʿār, Tehran, 1970. ʿAbd-al-Ḥosayn Zarrinkub, *Do qarn-e sokut*, Tehran, 1957.

(AHMAD ASHRAF)

iv. IN THE 19TH AND 20TH CENTURIES

Iran entered the age of nation-building and nationalism of the 19th century with the legacy of a longstanding historical awareness and cultural consciousness of its identity. The new Western ideas (which had been spread in the West since the late 18th century) received a new impetus with adaptations and reconstructions of a pre-existing concept of Iranian identity that had evolved over many centuries (see i, ii, and iii, above). Comparative historians of nationalism acknowledge that Iran was among the few nations that experienced the era of nationalism with a deep historical root and experience of recurrent construction of its own pre-modern identity (see, e.g., Seton-Watson, 1977, pp. 243-48, 251-55; Hobsbawm, 1990, pp. 69, 137; Smith, 2004, pp. 218-19, 229, 130, 186). The modern ideas of nation, nationalism, and national identity—as a set of sentiments about the nation and the modern nation-state, conveying the ideals of the autonomy, unity, and prosperity of the nation—came to reinforce the rich historical repertoire of Iranian identity. These new ideas also brought about a transformation of people's identity from subjects (*raʿāyā*) to citizens (with a recently coined term, *šahrvandān*). Furthermore, with such changes in political consciousness and identity, the sense of patriotism became separated from religious feelings, and loyalty to the nation became a new political value.

When the Iranian pre-modern society encountered the modern age of nationalism, it sought to create a new Iranian national identity on the basis of its own pre-existing ethnic and territorial ties, historical memories, and commemorations of historical events. In this new en-counter with the outside world, the enlightened members of Persian literati—whose predecessors had helped create and transmit the idea of Iranian identity since the late Sasanid era—came to form a nucleus of intellectuals (*rowšanfekrān*, i.e., the creators and reproducers of modern cultural ideas) with an expanding audience of intelligentsia (the educated people who are the con-sumers of those ideas). The new literati promoted the modern conceptions of nationalism and Iranian national identity based on the rich, centuries-old Persian cultural heritage (see iii, above; and IRAN iii. TRADITIONAL HIS-TORY). A telling example of Persian pre-existing historical memories that helped the construction of modern ideas of nation and nationalism was the frequent printing of an influential book on the history of ancient Kings of Persia (Fażl-Allāh Ḥosayni Qazvini, *Tāriḵ al-moʿjam fi āṯàr-e moluk-e ʿAjam*). Written in the 14th century with some 50 surviving manuscripts, this book was printed seven times between 1831 and 1891 in Tabriz, Tehran, and Isfahan and three in the early 20th century (see Story, I/1, 1970, pp. 243-44; Monzawi, VI, pp. 4386-89; and Mošār, I, cols. 3046-47). It was one of the most frequently reprinted works among a small number of popular reprinted titles in this period. Although the wide circulation of the book was due to its use as a textbook of the difficult Persian epistolary style, its use by a large group of students helped disseminate the information on the roots of Ira-nian "ethno-national" identity.

The new ideas of nation and nationalism in this period were reconstructed and disseminated mainly by those members of literati who had political, commercial, and cultural contacts with the West. Appearing sporadically in the 19th century, the ideas of popular, liberal nation-alism flourished in the course of the 1905-11 Constitu-tional Revolution (q.v.), and later they were transformed into a state-sponsored form of ethno-nationalism during the Pahlavi period (1925-78). This particular mode of Iranian nationalism and its related conception of Iranian identity was, however, later challenged by the popular na-tionalist movement that began in the mid-20th century. After a brief survey of the emerging national vocabulary in Persian literature, this entry will examine the above three phases in the development of Iranian identity in the 19th and 20th centuries.

The emerging national vocabulary of Iran. The term "nation," in its modern usage—which is derived from Latin *natio* (a group related by birth or place of origin)—emerged in various European languages predominantly in the 18th and 19th centuries. In Persian, the term *mellat* found currency as the equivalent of the term "nation" in the 19th century. The term *mellat* was, until then, used to denote any religious community, and more specifically, followers of a faith in possession of a holy book (a scrip-ture; *ahl-e ketāb*: Muslims, Jews, Christians, and Zoro-

astrians). The modern concept of "nation" originated from the concept of religious community (*mellat*) in two phases: first was constructed the notion of "Iranian Muslim na-tion" by addition of "Iran" to the traditional notion of Muslim religious community (*mellat-e Mosalmān*) to signify the Iranian component of the religious commu-nity (*mellat-e Mosalmān-e Irān*). Soon thereafter, by the dropping of the religious designation, the concept be-came simply the "Iranian nation" (*mellat-e Irān*). This conceptual metamorphosis of the term led to the new reading of *mellat* in the modern sense of the term, con-veying the meaning of the "nation" (see below). Yet the term continued to be used with two different connota-tions: one, the traditional reading with a religious conno-tation, and the other, the modern reading with a purely national connotation. This may be seen in the reaction of Fatḥ-ʿAli Āḵundzāda to the name and logo of *Ruz-nāma-ye mellat-e saniya-ye Irān*, published from 1866-70. The logo of the newspaper shows the picture of the Shah Mosque of Tehran (Masjed-e Šāh) as the symbol convey-ing the meaning of "the Iranian Muslim nation." In his satirical criticism of the logo, Āḵundzāda argues that, if the name of the paper refers to the nation of Iran, the cho-sen symbol of the mosque is not exclusively Iranian but belongs to all Muslim peoples. The symbol of Iranian people during the pre-Islamic era, he argues, was the monuments of Persian kings, such as Persepolis and Estaḵr, and in the Islamic period the monuments of the Safavids, who unified Iran with Shiʿsm as its state reli-gion (cited in Āryanpur I, pp. 239-40). A number of other terms related to the concepts of *mellat* also entered the contemporary political lexicon in the same period, e.g., *melliyat* (nationality), *waḥdat-e melli* (national unity or integrity), *melli* (national, and nationalist, pl. *melli-yun;*), *melli-gerāʾi* (nationalism), *howiyat-e melli* (national identity). Yet, it should be noted that the antecedents of the new term *mellat-e Irān* were not only its pre-modern religious connotation, but also a longstanding terminol-ogy referring to the Iranian people, including *Irāni* (plur. *irāniān*), *Pārsi* (plur. *Pārsiān*), *ahāli-e Irān* (Ar. *ahl al-fors*; meaning inhabitants of Persia; see iii, above).

The old terms *waṭan* (Ar.) or *mihan* (Pers.), which have found currency in modern times to mean "national home-land" (motherland or fatherland), were used in classical Persian literature to refer predominantly to a person's place of birth and habitation. One's place of birth and residence was the object of one's love, admiration, and devotion. Persians have often referred to the dictum, attributed to the Prophet, that "love of homeland is an article of faith" (*ḥobb al-waṭan men al-imān*). The terms *waṭan* and *mihan* have also found currency in modern times to convey the meaning of "patriotism" (Ar. *ḥobb al-waṭan*, Pers. *mihan-parasti* or Pers.-Ar. *waṭan-parasti*) or love and loyalty to the homeland and the nation-state. Understandably, the tradition of *ḥobb al-waṭan menaʾl-imān* has often been taken, retrospectively, to imply love for the "national homeland" of the Iranian people in classical Persian literature. Even the mystical, pantheis-tic notion of the dictum, meaning love for the "heavenly

kingdom," has been interpreted as love for the "national homeland" (see, e.g., Ḵubru-ye Pāk, p. 17). It is interesting to note that, on a few occasions in the late Safavid period (probably for the first time), the Hadith of ḥobb al-waṭan was extended beyond its local implication (place of birth or residence) to the whole country of Iran (see iii, above). An attempt to transform the usage of waṭan from birthplace to the national homeland was made in 1876, when a bilingual newspaper *Waṭan* began publication in Persian and French on 5 February. Explaining the title of the newspaper, the main article stated: "We have chosen *waṭan* (*patrie*) for the title of the paper because patriotism (*waṭan-parasti*) is the highest virtue, but in Iran it means primarily love of birthplace, whereas in its comprehensive usage it conveys the meaning of affection for the king, respect of laws and institutions of the nation, and obedience to the government rules" (cited in *Yādgār*, 1/7, 1945, pp. 16-17; for an account of the beginning of the usage of fatherland and motherland leading to "patriotic" and "matriotic" nationalisms, see Najmābādi, 2004, pp. 97-130; and Tavakoli-Targhi, 2001, pp. 113-34).

The territorial conception of Iran as a kingdom with a succession of dynasties has existed since the beginnings of Iranian traditional history including *irānšahr* and *irānzamin*, or *al-Fors* (Fārs), Ar. form of *Pārs* (Persia). The Persian term *kešvar*, which has entered the political lexicon of modern Iran as the equivalent of "country" (e.g., *kešvar-e Irān*), had been used to denote the dynastic realm or kingdom in pre-Islamic traditional history. The first usage of the term to denote a contemporary Iranian kingdom appears to have occurred in the Il-khanid era. It was used very rarely in medieval historiography (see iii, above; for a detailed account of the territorial origin of Iranian identity in the 19th and 20th centuries, see Kashani-Sabet).

NATIONAL IDENTITY IN REFORM MOVEMENTS AND REVOLUTION

National identity and reform movements. Persia's reform movement, which was primarily a response of the reforming Persian literati to the challenges of Western powers, was instrumental in promoting new ideas of nation and national homeland. They were aspiring to modernize the archaic government offices and adopt modern technology and political structure in order to develop Persia's capability to resist Western encroachment. Initiated by the Crown Prince ʿAbbās Mirzā (q.v.) with his reforming vizier, Mirzā Abu'l-Qāsem Qāʾem-maqām, during the early decades of the 19th century, the reform movement was substantively promoted under Amir Kabir (q.v.) in the period 1848-52. Amir Kabir, who had traveled to Russia and the Ottoman empire, became acquainted with modern institutions and used the new terms of "the zeal of nation and homeland," and "patriotism" (*ḡayrat-e mellat o ḵāk o waṭanparasti*). He was primarily concerned with infrastructural development of the government to safeguard Persia's integrity and self-determination; "we find him as the representative of Iranian nationalism against European political

and economic colonial penetration" (see Ādamiyat, 1977, p. 215; idem, 1969, pp. 159, 464).

The ideas of nationalism, constitutionalism, and progress further elaborated by such Western-educated literati and statesmen as Ḥosayn Khan Sepahsālār (Mošir-al-Dawla; 1828-81), who served as representative of Persia in Bombay, Tbilisi, and Istanbul, and also served as head of certain ministries, as well as in the grand vizierate (1971). Sepahsālār and his close associates, Malkam Khan Nāẓem-al-Dawla (1833-1908), Yusof Khan Mostašār-al-Dawla (d. 1895), and Majd-al-Molk Sinaki (1809-81), among others, advocated the formation of modern political institutions, as well as the new idea of popular nationalism as the prerequisite for progress. Sepahsālār was among the first to use the term *melliyat* to refer to the concept of nationality and nationalism, when he said "the foundation of nationality (*asās-e melliyat*) that was offered by the French Emperor, saying that each nation (*mellat*) should be governed by its own people" (cited in Ādamiyat, 1972, p. 131). His idea was the sovereignty of the nation and the changing of the status of the inhabitants from subjects (*raʿāyā*; the flocks) to citizens.

Modern schools and the printing press. The closing decades of the 19th century saw the introduction of modern education and the printing press. It is widely acknowledged that the spread of modern idea of nationalism in the West as well as in Asia and Africa was the byproduct of the development of the printing press and expansion of modern schools (symbolically called "press nationalism" and "school nationalism"; see, e.g., Anderson, 1991; Hobsbaum, 1983). As a result, thousands of Iranians became aware of modern political ideas and institutions (see EDUCATION). The introduction of Western education in Iran by missionary schools and, more importantly, the foundation of a polytechnic institute (Dār-al-Fonun; q.v.) in 1852 and the Faculty of Political Science (Madrasa-ye ʿolum-e siāsi) in 1899 (offering courses with textbooks on the history of Iran) significantly helped the spread of the new political ideas of nation and nationalism among the emerging intelligentsia. The foundation of printing houses in Tabriz, Tehran, Isfahan, and other major cities led to the publication of a score of books and newspapers. About one-fifth of these books (including reprints) were devoted to pre-Islamic Iran, including some ten reprints of an influential textbook on the history of pre-Islamic Persian kings (Ḥosayni Qazvini, *Tāriḵ al-moʿjam fi āṯār-e moluk-e ʿAjam*), a book on Sasanid history (*Tāriḵ-e Sāsāniān*), a book on the Parthian roots of the Qajars (Eʿtemād-al-Salṭana, 1891-93), the *Šāh-nāma* of Ferdowsi, an influential book representing the nationalistic ideas of a Neo-Zoroastrian movement (see *Dabestān al-maḏāheb*), and a book on Persian ethics (*Jāvidān ḵerad*). Furthermore, the import of Persian books published in India, as well as a number of Persian newspapers published in Calcutta, Istanbul, Cairo, London, and Paris, helped further the dissemination of the critical political ideas as well as a nationalistic ideology among the Persian intelligentsia.

Romantic nationalism. Identification with the glorious past through imagined places and golden ages helps

people to go beyond the miserable and deplorable present. It was natural then for the early proponents of nationalism in Iran to search for Iran's national spirit and glory, the primordial soul of an organic entity with its own distinct culture. There developed a belief in the idea that there had been continuity in Iran's history from the immemorial past to modern times with a romantic view of a pre-Islamic golden age. The intellectual forerunners of romantic nationalism included Mirzā Fatḥ-ʿAli Āḵundzāda, Jalāl-al-Din Mirzā Qājār, and Mirzā Āqā Khan Kermāni (qq.v.). They introduced the basic ideals of the autonomy, the unity, and the prosperity of the Iranian nation with patriotic devotion. Their works are devoted to cultivation of the love of national homeland (*ḥobb-e waṭan*) as a spiritual need of the people. The recurrent theme in their works is their distaste for the Arab conquest of Iran and comparison and contrast of the deplorable conditions of the country with its glorious pre-Islamic past, on the one hand, and with the developed nations of the West, on the other. In search of root causes of the decline of the nation and the means for its resurrection, they blame the absolutism of the corrupt and incompetent members of the ruling classes: the political as well as the clerical elements. As a major requirement for the country's development, they craved for liberation from the alien Islamic past through a purification of the Persian language from Arabic words and the embracing of Western civilization (for a survey of the merging nationalist ideas in the latter half of the 19th century, see Cole, 1996, pp. 35-56).

Mirzā Fatḥ-ʿAli Āḵundzāda (1812-78), from Azerbaijan, proudly identified as being of Persian stock (*nežād-e Irāni*), belonging to the nation of Iran (*mellat-e Irāni*) and to the Iranian homeland (*waṭan*; cited in Adamiyat, 1970, p. 9). Āḵundzāda influenced Jālāl-al-Din Mirzā through friendship and correspondence as well as Mirzā Āqā Khan Kermāni (ibid., pp. 108-36). Jalāl al-Dīn Mirza (1826-70), a Qajar prince, initiated the reconstruction of Iranian national history in his *Nāma-ye ḵosravān* (Book of the Monarchs), the first history textbook for Dār-al-Fonun in simple Persian, purified of Arabic words. His fourfold Persian dynastic history is arranged from the first man to the Qajars. The first part from Mahābādiān to Sasanid, shows the influence of the neo-Zoroastrian mythologized *Dasātir* movement (q.v.; see Amanat, 1997; for the influence of this movement on romantic nationalism of this period, see Tavakoli-Tarqi, 1991, pp. 86-95). Mirzā Āqā Khan Kermāni (1854-96) followed Jalāl-al-Din Mirzā in producing a national history of Iran, *Āʾina-ye sekandari*, extending from the mythological past to the Qajar era, to compare and contrast Iran's glorious past with its present plight (see Ādamiyat, 1978, pp. 149-211). Influenced by these ideas, the Persian literati even invented an "Iranian origin" for the last Turkic dynasty of Iran, connecting the Qajars to the Parthian dynasty (see Eʿtemād-al-Salṭana, 1891-93).

Dissemination of the romantic nationalism of these intellectual figures and the nationalistic ideas of the reforming ministers contributed significantly to the intellectual ferment and ideological orientation of the Constitutional Revolution.

Constitutional Revolution and national identity. The intellectual ideas of the constitutional movement was primarily oriented toward two fundamental goals: creating a 'modern nation-state' in order to develop the resources of the country and protect its autonomy vis-à-vis foreign powers, and forming a nation by transforming the people from "subjects" (*raʿāyā*) to citizens, with a greater participation in the political life of the country. Furthermore, this national idea of *mellat-e Irān* encompassed all peoples of Iran regardless of their religious affiliation, ethnic origin, spoken language, or socio-economic status. It was in terms of these principles that the Constitutional Revolution became a patriotic, nationalist movement. Thus from its inception the idea of "national sovereignty of Iranian people" became the slogan of those who advocated constitutionalism, secularism, progress, and equality.

The appearance of scores of newspapers and journals in the course of the revolution helped spread the ideas of nationhood and national sovereignty among the urban population. Derived from the term nation (*mellat*), the concept of national (*melli*) gained increasing popularity. It was used, for example, to refer to the National Consultative Assembly (Majles-e šurā-ye melli), the National Bank (Bānk-e melli), the epithets of national heroes: national commander (*sardār-e melli*) for Sattār Khan, and national leader (*sālār-e melli*) for Bāqer Khan (q.v.)—the commanders of the prolonged armed resistance of the constitutionalist forces in Tabriz (see CONSTITUTIONAL REVOLUTION i).

In this period a new generation of Persian literati, influenced by the forerunners of nationalism in Iran, appeared on the scene. These included Forṣat Širāzi (q.v.; 1855-1921), the author of *Āṯār-e ʿAjam*, the first Persian work introducing the ancient monuments and archeological sites of Fārs. In his political papers, Forṣat attributes the deplorable conditions of Persia to the ignorance of its people and the tyranny of its rulers, calling for drastic reforms (Forṣat-al-Dawla, 1904). Other influential figures include Malek-al-Motakallemin (1860-1907), who, impressed by the Japanese model of progress, advocated a more rational use of natural resources for industrialization of the country (Malekzāda, 1946, pp. 91-98). Also influential were two Azerbaijani authors, ʿAbd-al-Raḥim Ṭālebof (1835-1910) and Zayn-al-ʿĀbedin Marāḡaʾi (1839-1910). The former advocated a scientific and political awakening of Persia, while the latter deplored the miserable life of the people and cried for love of the nation and its salvation.

The disillusionment of nationalist supporters of the Constitutional Revolution with the 1907 Anglo-Russian agreement (q.v.), which divided Iran into two zones of influence, led to resurgence of the romantic nationalism, anti-imperialism, and ideas of socialism. Thus, for example, the poets of the Constitutional Revolution may be divided into three distinct types: (1) Those who consider the national homeland in its Islamic or even its Shiʿite form, such as Adib Pišāvari (q.v.; 1844-1930) and Sayyed Ašraf-al-Din Gilāni (1870-1933). (2) Those poets who

were influenced by modern, Western conception of homeland such as Abu'l-Qāsem ʿĀref (1883-1933) and Mirzādeh ʿEšqi (qq.v.;1893-1924) and wrote on the themes of patriotism, freedom, and anti-colonialism. Also belonging to this group was Moḥammad-Ebrāhim Farroḵi Yazdi (1888-1939), who espoused patriotic socialism and called for love, devotion, and sacrifice for Iran and its working peoples. (3) Those who followed a hybrid religio-national response, such as Malek-al-Šoʿarāʾ Bahār (q.v.; 1866-1951), who wrote powerful poems glorifying pre-Islamic Iran while at the same time looking at the Islamic heritage of Iran with respect (see Šafiʿi Kadkani, pp. 22-23). In contrast, Aḥmad Kasrawi (1888-1945), a prolific author, published scores of political pamphlets combining nationalistic and anti-religious (including Shiʿism, Sufism, and Bahāʾism) sentiments and advocated a radical approach toward purification of Persian from Arabic words (see Kasrawi, 1978).

The post-Constitutional period saw a nationalist reaction to the country's political decay, which was best manifested in three influential journals during the period of 1916-28: *Kāva*, edited and published in Berlin by Sayyed Ḥasan Taqizādeh (*qq.v.), a leading veteran of the Constitutional Revolution and the leader of Iran's nationalist committee in Berlin (Komita-ye melliyun-e Irān); *Irānšahr*, also published in Berlin by Ḥosayn Kāẓemzādeh Irānšahr (qq.v.); and *Āyanda* (q.v.), published in Tehran by Maḥmud Afšār (*q.v.). Kāẓemzādeh Irānšahr, an ardent nationalist, set forth his views in a number of essays in his journal (1922-26), and more specifically in his *Tajalliyāt-e ruḥ-e irāni* (The manifestation of Iranian spirit). He had maintained a clear romantic and primordialist notion of the Aryan race and the superior character of the Iranian peoples, which has manifested itself throughout the history of the nation. In various articles in his journal *Āyanda* (1925-27, 1944-45, 1955), Afšār, a political scientist, pioneered a systematic scholarly treatment of various aspects of Iranian national identity, territorial integrity, and national unity. An influential nationalist, he also displayed a strong belief in the nationalist character of Iranian people throughout the country's long history. He was the first to propose the idea of Pan-Iranism to safeguard the unity and territorial integrity of the nation against the onslaught of Pan-Turkism and Pan-Arabism (Afšār, p. 187).

The late Qajar and early Pahlavi period saw the emergence, also, of a number of historical novels and plays, combining the historical facts and fictional imagination to portray the period's nostalgia for Persia's glorious past; these included Ṣādeq Hedāyat's (q.v.) *Parvin doḵtar-e Sāsān* (see FICTION 2b).

THE RISE OF STATE NATIONALISM IN THE
PAHLAVI ERA

Similar to the common pattern of the early 20th century, the Pahlavi nation-state was founded on self-glorification. Celebration and commemoration of the collective historical memory through symbols and myths, rituals and ceremonies, museums and archeological sites,

Achaemenid architectural design for public edifices, nationalistic music, and a national dress code became its hallmarks. In this period, the emerging nationalist historical writings shifted from the emphasis on the continuity with "the traditional history" to the continuity with "factual history" by emphasizing the Achaemenid period as the political origin of the state (see HISTORIOGRAPHY viii and ix). This historical restoration of the Achaemenid era with the help of Western scholars is often misinterpreted by those who, influenced by Eurocentric, modernist orthodoxy, tend to portray the whole of Iran's traditional history as an invention or imagination of "Orientalists" (see Vaziri, 1993; for the neglect of the Median and Achaemenid history, see Yarshater, 1984; for the recurrent updating of Iran's factual history from the Sasanid to the contemporary dynasties, see iii, above).

It was during this early period of the Pahlavi rule that scholarly historical writings began to develop. Ḥosayn Pirniā's pioneering work on the history of ancient Iran (3 vols., Tehran, 1931-33) and ʿAbbās Eqbāl-Āštiāni's textbook on history of Iran from the advent of Islam to the fall of the Qajars (Tehran, 1939), and ʿAbd-Allāh Rāzi's work on Iran's history from the ancient times to the year 1937 (Tehran, 1938) constituted textbooks of factual history of Iran from ancient to modern times. These texts helped develop a new historical consciousness for the reading public. Meanwhile a number of Iranian scholars began to see a cultural continuity between pre-Islamic and medieval Islamic Iran. In this context, Ebrāhim Pur-Dāwud, the pioneer of Avestan studies in Persia and an ardent advocate of Iranian nationalism, examined the influence of Zorastrianism and pre-Islamic culture on the emerging Islamic civilization in Iran. He suggested that "our land, our race, and our language have remained the same for several thousand years" (in Moʿin, 1947, pp. 1-4). Moḥammad Moḥammadi Malāyeri (1944, 1975, revised ed., 1995) elaborated on Persian influence in Mesopotamia, the central province of both the Sasanid and the Islamic empires, during the Abbasid caliphate. Moḥammad Moʿin (1947), too, wrote on the influence of Mazdean ideas on recurrent motifs in classical Persian literature and mysticism. Ḏabiḥ-Allāh Ṣafā in his influential work on the history of epic writing and legendry in Iran (1st ed., 1942; 4th ed., 1984) and in his history of literature in Iran (1953-83), as well as the summary of political, social, and cultural history of Ian from the beginning to the end of the Safavid period (1977), also promoted the new, nationalist view of Iran's history. A new, ultra-nationalist trend in Persian historical writings of this period was initiated by Ḏabiḥ Behruz (q.v) and his disciples (see HISTORIOGRAPHY ix).

Western scholars of pre-Islamic and medieval Islamic periods also helped the promotion of scholarship on Iran's history. These include important contributions of Ignaz Goldziher, Ernst Herzfeld, Vladimir Minorsky, Bertold Spuler, Samuel Stern; they used the "nationalist scheme" and its related key concepts of "national character" and "national sentiment" to demonstrate the formation of the Iranian nation with a vivid "national identity" during

the Achaemenid period (Herzfeld, 1936) and its revival during the 9th-11th centuries and later (see, e.g., Gold-zieher, 1998-99, 1951; Minorsky, 1932, 1956; Spuler, 1952 and 1955; Stern, 1971). Herzfeld's (q.v.) idea of Achaemenid Iran as a geo-political concept, as "the empire of the Aryans," as well as his idea that the Iranian "nation" in its combined geographical and political sense emerged during the Achaemenid period, were adopted as the formal ideological framework of the Pahlavi state. These ideas laid the foundation of what Alessandro Bausani (1975, p. 46) calls "Aryan and Neo-Achaemenid nationalism." They led to four historical innovations: the change, in Western languages, of the country's name from Persia to Iran in 1935, signifying the primordial Aryan origin of the nation; the assumption of the title Āryā-mehr (the Sun of the Aryans) by Moḥammad Reżā Shah in 1965; celebration of the 2,500 years of Persian empire in 1971; and finally, the change of the national calendar from the Islamic Hejri to the invented Šāhanšāhi—the time of the formation of the Persian empire by Cyrus the Great (see Herzfeld, 1935; for a recent support for his idea, see Shahbazi, 2001; for a critical analysis, see Gnoli, 1968, pp. 1-27).

This emphasis on 25 centuries of Persian empire as the main pillar of Iranian identity was drawn from the notion of loyalty to the kingdom of Iran, whose custodian is the king. Accordingly, Iranian identity derived from the king's divinely ordained sovereignty, a glory bestowed upon him as a gift of grace (*farr-e Izadi*; see FARR), and the love of homeland was seen as the love of the kingdom of Iran. The well-known slogan of "God, Shah, Homeland" (*ḵodā*, *šāh*, *mihan*), which was adopted by the Pahlavi dynasty as an expression of the Iranians' loyalty to the shah and his kingdom, did not leave much room for the concept of the "sovereignty of the nation." Such a notion of sovereignty could not be reconciled, furthermore, with the basic principle of the Constitutional Revolution which declared: "Kingship is a gift that with divine will is bestowed upon the person of the king by the nation" (article thirty-five: *Salṭanat wadiʿaist ke be muhebat-e elāhi az ṭaraf-e mellat be šaḵṣ-e pādšāh mofawważ šodeh*).

The Pahlavi era saw not only the emergence and growth of a nation-state with a clear national policy, but also the rise of a national consciousness that attempted to promote a feeling of belonging to a modern nation with a glorious history spanning more than 25 centuries. This was aided by a vigorous dissemination of the idea of "Iran" as a part of a broad campaign to raise literacy levels, the rapid growth of urbanization and communications, the emergence of a middle class and an educated urban group, and the formation of a national market.

History and language were two important bases for the formation of the new "state nationalism" under the Pahlavis. The historical agenda included an emphasis on the Achaemenid era (as discussed above) and the encouragement of archeological excavations by American and European archeologists. The foundation of an archeological museum in Tehran (Muza-ye Irān-e bāstān), construction of public edifices with Achaemenid motifs (see

ARCHITECTURE vi. REŻĀ SHAH PERIOD), and the foundation of the National Monuments Council of Iran (ANJOMAN-E ĀṮĀR-E MELLI) were part of these efforts (see Meskoob, 1994).

Furthermore, a nationalist current in Persian music was encouraged in this period. The main figures in this movement were ʿAli-Naqi Waziri and Sayyed Jawād Badiʿzāda. Waziri composed a number of marches to mobilize the younger generation to serve the nation. His "Toward the Throne" (*Besu-ye taḵt*) was composed during the coronation of Reza Shah (see Ḵāleqi, II, pp. 103-7, 222-23). Badiʿzāda, a popular vocalist and prolific singer and composer, wrote national hymns glorifying Iran's past and present. Recorded in Berlin, these hymns were widely disseminated among the growing middle classes, who had access to "His Master's Voice" gramophones. He was a genuine romantic nationalist with records whose motifs included glorifying the Persian flag, calling Iran the country of Darius (*Irān ey kešvar-e Dāryuš*), praising the unveiling of women, and celebrating the completion of the Iranian trans-national railway system, and the national anthem (see Badiʿzāda, pp. sizdah, 126-27, 154, 221). Later, during the occupation of Iran by allied forces, in the early and mid-1940s, Gol-golāb (q.v.) wrote two national songs, with music composed by Ruḥ-Allāh Ḵāleqi: "Āḏarābādegān," during the Azerbaijan secessionist movement of 1945-46 and "Ey Irān" (O Iran); the latter has achieved great popularity among Iranians of different backgrounds and political persuasions.

The state language policy sought to purge Arabic and other "foreign" words from Persian. The idea of purification of Persian from Arabic had been started in the latter half of the 19th century by a small group of romantic nationalist intellectuals (see above). The first systematic attempt to find Persian words for new technical terms, but with no intention for purification of Persian, took place on the eve of the Constitutional Revolution and involved the formation of a forum, "The Academic Assembly" (Majles-e ākādemi), that met on a monthly basis in 1903 (Āryanpur, III, p. 16). Several other short-lived organizations, formed during the period 1924-35, continued the search for Persian words, particularly in new military and technical arenas. This led to many imprecise coinages and to heated arguments for and against the purification movement. These attempts gathered momentum when Reża Shah visited Turkey in 1934, where he learned of Kemal Atatürk's promotion of a similar project (for a comparison of language reform in Turkey and Iran, see Perry, 1985, pp. 295-311). It was under these circumstances that the Iranian Academy of Language (Farhangestān-e Zabān-e Irān; q.v.), was established in 1935 on the initiative of prime minister M.-ʿA. Forugi (q.v.); it aimed at replacing Arabic words with carefully chosen Persian equivalents (see Forugi, "My Message to the Academy" [*Payām-e man be Farhangestān*]; and Ḥ. Taqizādeh, "The National Literary Movement" [*Nahżat-e melli-e adabi*]). During its six years of activity until 1941, the first Farhangestān adopted over 3,500 words, including place-names (see Bayāt). Follow-

ing a long dormant phase which began with Reza Shah's abdication in 1941, the Academy of Languages was reactivated in 1970 with Ṣādeq Kiā, as its president. A disciple of Ḏabiḥ-Allāh Behruz, Kiā was an ardent advocate of the purification of Persian words from Arabic. By the 1979 Revolution, the second Farhangestān had collected and approved Persian equivalents for 1,470 technical terms and loanwords from Arabic and European languages (see FARHANGESTĀN).

The politics of Iranian identity. Drawn to different ideological agendas for reconstructing modern Iran, the Persian intelligentsia has been divided among a number of contesting groups since the middle of the 20th century. The main controversy derived from two fundamental objectives of the Constitutional Revolution: the foundation of a nation-state and the development of a civil society that can transform people from subjects (*ra'āyā*) to citizens with the right to participate in national affairs. The Pahlavi state focused on the former at the expense of the latter. The Pahlavi shahs believed that the country's modernization would pave the way for the creation of a civil society. A large group of intelligentsia, too, came to adopt the idea of 25 centuries of Persian empire as the foundation of Iranian national identity. Two prominent examples in the early period, were members of the Radical Party (Ḥezb-e Rādikāl), which was founded by ʿAli-Akbar Dāvar (q.v.), who was an architect of the formation of the Pahlavi state and modernization of the country, and a group of Western-educated Iranians who formed the Iran Javān Club (q.v.) under the leadership of ʿAli-Akbar Siāsi. A group of Western-educated technocrats who were also dedicated to the cause of the progress and prosperity of Iran became involved in the drive towards rapid economic growth and modernization of the country during the 1960s, with the Plan Organization, Central Bank, and Ministry of Economy as their base of activities (see ʿĀliḵāni, 2002, pp. 73-74). However, the main organs of propaganda advocating "Achaemenid nationalism," were the state-sponsored political parties, Melliyun, Irān-e Novin, Mardom, and Rastāḵiz, all formed in the period from mid-1950s to mid-1970s (for the positive nationalism of the shah, see Cottam, pp. 286-311).

A second group of intelligentsia envisioned the development of a civil society as a prerequisite to national formation; they underscored liberal nationalist ideas and as such were identified with popular nationalism. The main proponents of this mode of national identity in the mid-20th century included the National Front (Jebha-ye melli), a loose coalition of various organizations (under the leadership of Mohammad Moṣaddeq) with different persuasions from the right to the left of the political spectrum (see Cottam, pp. 243-85).

The third group, challenging the state-sponsored notion of national identity included the supporters of leftist ideologies who championed the cause of Iranian peoples. These groups often tend to shift the question of Iranian collective identity from its 'national' perspective to its component peoples; they speak not of Iranian nation but of Iranian peoples (*ḵalqhā-ye Irān*) who are made up of different nationalities. To them, Iran is a multi-national country where, by definition, the right of ethnic minorities to self-rule should be recognized. The leftist view was influenced by the establishment of the Union of Soviet Republics and shaped by the collective identities of the peoples of the southern republics in the Caucasus and Central Asia in the period from the early 1920s to the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1989. While the internal policy of the Soviet Union consistently suppressed national sentiments in its socialist republics, its propaganda machine encouraged separatist movements in other countries (see Connor, 1984). A manifestation of this policy in practice was the formation of the republics of Azerbaijan and Kurdistan with the help of Red Army in 1945-46 (see Cottam, pp. 65-74, 118-33; for an analytical survey of various politial movements with national aspirations among Kurdish, Aḏari, and Baluchi peoples, see Ahmadi, 2000; see further IRAN v. PEOPLES OF IRAN (1); IDENTITY v. IN POST-REVOLUTIONARY PERIOD in Supplement online forthcoming).

The fourth notion of Iranian national identity is a religious one. Ayatollah Mortażā Moṭahhari, ʿAli Šariʿati, and Mehdi Bāzargān were among the main proponents of the Iranian religio-national identity. For Moṭahhari a moderate and peaceful nationalism leading to cooperation and social ties among people is compatible with the Iranian-Islamic national identity (Moṭahhari, pp. 62-67). Šariʿati defines nation and nationality in relation to culture and, therefore, sees a close relationship between these terms and religion. Following this line, it is maintained that during the last 14 centuries the two histories of Islam and Iran have become so intermingled that it is impossible to search for Iranian identity without Islam or for Islamic identity without a strong Iranian presence within it. In Šariʿati's view, these two elements of *Irān-e Eslāmi* constitute Iranian identity. He believes cultural and national alienation can only be overcome by relying on the Iranian nation while supporting its Shiʿite culture (Šariʿati, pp. 72-73). Bāzargān, in his talk during the critical transitional moment between the fall of the shah and the rise of the Islamic Republic, notes that "to oppose Islam to Iranian nationalism is tantamount to destroying ourselves. To deny Iranian identity and consider nationalism irreligious is part and parcel of the anti-Iranian movement and is the work of the anti-revolutionaries" (Bāzargān, cited by Maḥmud Afšār, 1959, p. 655; for detail, see Chehabi, 1990).

The findings of a recent cross-cultural survey comparing Iran, Egypt, and Jordan, which was carried out in 2000-01, may be relevant to the question of the relationship between nationality and religiosity. The survey showed a lower level of religiosity among Iranian respondents compared to their Egyptian and Jordanian counterpoints, but a much higher level of national sentiment. While in Jordan and Egypt only 14 percent and 10 percent of the respondents, respectively, indicated that they are "Jordanian" or "Egyptian" above all," 34 percent of Iranians identified themselves as "Iranian above all" (see M. Moaddel and T. Azadarmaki, p. 302).

CONCLUSION

In the Iran of the late 20th century, similar to many other societies, ethno-linguistic affiliations and provincial and tribal ties, often compete with national identity. Yet, in spite of these multiple identities, a deeply rooted cultural awareness and a historical consciousness of continuity in a long and distinctive history of the country have served as a strong cohesive force to help overcome various divisive currents. The findings of a national survey, conducted in provincial capitals of 28 provinces in 2001, shows people's strong ties to their "Iranian" identity. In answering the question, "to what extent are you proud of being an Iranian?" 68 percent of respondents indicated that they highly value their Iranian identity, including 35 percent who answered "fully" (*kāmelan*) and 33 percent who answered "very high" (*keyli ziād*). Furthermore, 27 percent of respondents valued their Iranian identity moderately to highly, with 19 percent at the higher level (*ziād*), and 8 percent at the medium level (*motewasseṭ*). The lower levels accounted for only 5 percent of respondents. When the sample was divided according to the educational level of respondents, those with lower levels of education showed the higher levels of feeling of national identity: 92 percent of those with no education or with primary education indicated greater feeling of national identity, compared to 86 percent of those with secondary education and 80 percent of those with higher education (Wezārat-e eršād-e Eslāmi, pp. 249-50).

Finally, a conscious belief in "Iran's cultural distinctiveness" served as the foundation and common denominator of Iranian identity and the binding force among Iranians for centuries, with Persian literature, and more specifically, Persian poetry, as its core element. Furthermore, with a strong tradition of oral literature, particularly poetry, the idea of "Iran" and its elements in Persian cultural heritage have been widely disseminated through *naqqāli* and *Šāh-nāma kʷāni*, to the masses in urban, rural, and tribal areas. There are many illiterate people who know verses from the *Divān*s of Hafez and Saʿdi and the *Šāh-nāma* of Ferdowsi by heart and often refer to them in their daily social discourse.

Bibliography: Faridun Ādamiyat, *Fekr-e āzādi wa moqaddama-ye nahżat-e mašruṭiyat*, Tehran, 1961. Idem, *Andiša-ye taraqqi wa ḥokumat-e qānun*, Tehran, 1972. Idem, *Amir-e Kabir wa Irān*, 5th ed., Tehran, 1976. Idem, *Andišahā-ye Mīrzā Āqā Ḵān Kermāni*, Tehran, 1978. Maḥmud Afšār, *Ganjina-ye maqālāt* I: *maqālāt-e siāsi yā siāsat-nāma-ye jadid*, ed. Iraj Afšār, Tehran, 1989. Idem "Mellat o melliyat-e Irān," in ibid., pp. 259-80. Idem, "Melliyat o waḥdat-e melli," in ibid., pp. 184-91. Ḥamid Aḥmadi, *Qawmiyat wa qawmger-āyi dar Irān*, Tehran, 2000. Idem *Howiyat, melliyat, qawmiyat dar Irān*, Tehran 2005. Hamid Algar, "Malkum Khan, Akhundzada and the Proposed Reform of the Arabic Alphabet," *Middle Eastern Studies* 5/2, 1969, pp. 116-30. ʿĀlinaqi ʿĀliḵāni, *Siāsat o siāsatgozāri-e eqteṣādi dar Iran 1340-1350* (Ideology, politics, and process in Iran's economic development 1960-1970, an interview with Alinaghi Alikhani), ed. G.-R. Afkhami, Bethesda, Md., 2001. Abbas Amanat, "Pur-e ḵāqān wa andiša-ye bāzyābi-e tāriḵ-e melli-e Irān," *Iran Nameh* 17/1, Winter 1999, pp. 5-54. Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, London, 1983; 2nd ed., 1991. Mirzā Āqā Khan Kermāni, *Āʾina-ye sekandari*, 2 vols., Tehran, 1906-08. Yaḥyā Āryanpur, *Az Ṣabā tā Nimā*, 3 vols., Tehran, 1972-95. Ahmad Ashraf, "The Crisis of National and Ethnic Identities in Contemporary Iran," *Iranian Studies* 26/1-2, 1993, pp. 159-64. Idem, "Boḥrān-e howiyat-e melli wa qawmi dar Irān," *Iran Nameh* 7/3, 1994, pp. 521-50. Sayyed Jawād Badiʿzāda, *Golbāng-e meḥrāb tā bāng-e mežrāb: ḵāṭerāt-e Sayyed Jawād Badiʿzāda (1281-1358)*, ed. Elāha Badiʿzāda and S. ʿA.-R. Mir ʿAli-Naqi, Tehran. 2001. Faridun Badrāʾi, *Vāžagān-e neveštāri-e kudakān-e dabestāni-e Irān*, Tehran, 1973. Amin Banani, *The Modernization of Iran, 1921-1941*, Stanford, 1961. Kāveh Bayāt, "Farhang-estañ wa taḡyir-e asāmi-e joḡrāfiāʾi dar Irān," *Našr-e dāneš* 11, 1990–91, pp. 172–84. Idem, "The Ethnic Question in Iran," *Middle East Report* 237, 2005, pp. 42-45. Mehdi Bāzargān, "Nahżat-e žedd-e irāni," in *Keyhān*, 23 Šahrivar 1359/14 September 1980, cited in Dr. Maḥmud Afšār, "Waḥdat-e melli wa tamā-miyat-e arżi," *Ayanda* 6/9-12, 1980, p. 655.

Houchang Chehabi, *Iranian Politics and Religious Modernism: The Liberation Movement of Iran under the Shah and Khomeini*, Ithaca, 1990. Idem, "Staging the Emperor's New Clothes: Dress Codes and Nation-Building under Reza Shah," *Iranian Studies* 26/3-4, 1993, pp. 209-33. Juan Cole, "Marking Boundaries, Marking Time: The Iranian Past and the Construction of the Self by Qajar Thinkers," *Iranian Studies* 29/1-2, 1996, pp. 35-56. Walker Connor, *The National Question in the Marxist-Leninist Theory and Strategy*, Princeton, 1984. Richard Cottam, *Nationalism in Iran*, 2nd. ed., Pittsburgh, 1979. ʿAbbās Eqbāl-Āštiāni, *Tāriḵ-e mofaṣṣal-e Irān az ṣadr-e Eslām tā enqerāż-e Qājāriya*, ed. M. Dabirsiāqi, Tehran, 1968 (first part from the advent of Islam until the Mongol domination, Tehran, 1933). Moḥamamd Ḥasan Eʿtemād-al-Salṭana, *Dorar al-tijān fi ansāb bani Aškān*, 2 vols., Tehran, 1891-93. Forṣat-al-Dawla, Moḥammad Naṣir Ḥosayni Širāzi, *Aṭār al-ʿAjam*, Shiraz, 1314/1897. Idem, *Maqālāt-e ʿelmi wa siāsi* II, Bombay, 1904. M.-ʿA. Foruḡi, *Payām-e man be Farhangestañ*, Tehran, 1937. Gherardo Gnoli, *The Idea of Iran: An Essay on Its Origin*, Rome, 1989. Ignaz Goldziher, *Muhammedanisch Studien* I, Halle, 1889; ed. S. M. Stern, tr. C. M. Barber and S. M. Stern as *Muslim Studies*, I, London, 1966. Koichi, Haneda. "The Meaning of Iran: Preliminary Essay on the Emergence of 'Iranian' Consciousness," *Journal of Asian and African Studies* 27, 1984, pp. 188-93. Ernst Herzfeld, *Archaeological History of Iran*, London, 1935. Idem, *Iran in the Ancient East*, London, 1941. Idem, *The Persian Empire: Studies in Geography and Ethnography of the Ancient Near East*, ed. G. Walser, Wiesbaden, 1968. Eric Hobsbawm, *Nations and Nationalism Since 1780: Program,*

Myth, *Reality*, Cambridge, 1990. Eric Hobsbawm and T. Ranger, eds., *The Invention of Traditions*, Cambridge, 1983. Kāẓemzāda Irānšahr, *Tajalliyāt-e ruḥ-e irāni dar adwār-e tāriḵi*, Berlin, 1924. M.-ʿA. Jazāyeri (Jazayery), "The Modernization of Persian Vocabulary and Language Reform in Iran," in I. Fodor and C. Hageàge, eds., *Language Reform: History and Future* II, Hamburg, 1983, pp. 241-67.

Ruḥ-Allāh Ḵāleqi, *Sargozašt-e musiqi-e Irān*, 2 vols., Tehran, 1954. Firoozeh Kashani-Sabet, *Fiction Boundaries*, Princeton, 1999. Aḥmad Kasrawi, *Neveštahā-ye Kasrawi dar zamina-ye zabān-e fārsi*, ed. Ḥ. Yazdāniān, Tehran, 1978. Nikki Keddie, "Religion and Irreligion in Early Iranian Nationalism," *Comparative Studies is Society and History* 43, 1962, pp. 265-95. *Ketab-e Nimā*, special issue on *Zabān o howiyat-e melli*, Los Angeles, 1990. M. Ḵubru-ye Pāk, "Noḵbagān-e maḥalli, jahānisāzi wa roʾyā-ye federalism," in Ḥ. Aḥmadi, ed., *Iran: ḥowiyat, melliyat, qawmiyat*, Tehran, 2004, pp. 171-88. Ann K. S. Lambton, "Ḵawmiyya iii: in Persia," in *EI*² IV, 1978, pp. 785-90. M. Malekzāda, *Zendagāni-e Malek-al-Motakallemin*, Tehran, 1946. Zayn-al-Ābedin Marāḡaʾi, *Siāḥat-nāma-ye Ebrāhim beyg yā balā-ye taʿaṣṣob-e u*, Tehran, 1965. Shahrokh Meskoob, "Melligerāʾi, tamarkoz wa farhang dar ḡorub-e Qājāriya wa ṭoluʿ-e Pahlavi, *Iran Nameh* 12/3, 1994, pp. 479-508. Vladimir Minorsky, "Persian: Religion and History," in G. E. von Grunebaum, ed. *Unity and Variety in Muslim Civilization*, Chicago, 1955. pp. 173-90; repr. in V. Minorsky, *Iranica: Twenty Articles/Bist maqāla-ye Minorski*, Tehran, 1964, pp. 242-59. Mansour Moaddel and T. Azadarmaki, "The Worldviews of Islamic Publics: The Cases in Egypt, Iran, and Jordan," in *Comparative Sociology* 1/3-4, 2002, pp. 299-319. Moḥammad Moḥammadi Malāyeri, *Farhang-e irāni-e piš az Eslām wa āṯār-e ān dar tamaddon-e eslāmi wa adabiyāt-e ʿarabi*, Tehran, 1944, 1975; revised ed., 1995. Moḥammad Moʿin, *Mazdyasnā wa taʾṯir-e ān dar adab-e fārsi*, Tehran, 1947. Aḥmad Monzawi, *Fehrest-e nosḵahā-ye ḵaṭṭi-e fārsi* VI, Tehran, 1974. Ḵānbābā Mošār, *Fehrest-e ketābhā-ye čāpi-e fārsi*, 3 vols., Tehran, 1973. Mortażā Moṭahhari, *Ḵadamāt-e moteqābel-e Eslām wa Irān*, 8th ed., Qom, 1978. Afsaneh Najmabadi, *Women with Mustaches and Men without Beard: Gender and Sexual Anxieties of Iranian Modernity*, Berkeley, 2005, pp. 97-131. Nāẓem-al-Eslām Kermāni, *Tāriḵ-e bidāri-e Irāniān*, ed. ʿAli-akbar Saʿidi Sirjāni, 2 vols., Tehran, 1982.

ʿAbbās Parviz, *Qiām-e Irāniān dar rāh-e tajdid-e majd o ʿaẓamat-e Irān*, Tehran, 1972. John Perry, "Language Reform in Turkey and Iran," *IJMES* 17, 1985, pp. 295-311. Ḥasan Pirniā, *Irān-e bāstān*, 3 vols., Tehran, 1932-34. Jahāngir Qāʾem-maqāmi, *Yak ṣad o panjāh sanad-e tāriḵi*, Tehran, 1969. ʿAbd-Allāh Rāzi, *Tāriḵ-e Irān az azmena-ye bāstāni tā sāl-e 1316*, Tehran, 1938. Ḏabih-Allāh Ṣafā, *Tāriḵ-e adabiyāt dar Irān*, 6 vols. in 9, Tehran, 1953-92. Idem, *Ḥamāsa-sarāyi dar Irān*, Tehran, 4th ed., 1984. M.-R. Šafiʿi Kadkani, "Talaqqi-e qodamāʾ az waṭan," *Alefbā* 2, 1973, pp. 1-26. ʿAli

Šariʿati, *Bāzšenāsi-e howiyat-e irāni-eslāmi*, Tehran, 1982. Sayyed Ḥasan Taqīzāda, "Jonbeš-e melli-e adabi," *Armaḡān* 22, 1942, pp. 372-98. Hugh Seton-Watson, *Nations and States: An Enquiry into the Origins of Nations and the Politics of Nationalism*, Boulder, Colo., 1977. A. Shapur Shahbazi, "The History of the Idea of Iran," in Vesta Sarkhosh Curtis and Sarah Stewart, eds., *Birth of the Persian Empire*, London and New York, 2005, pp. 100-111. Anthony D. Smith, *The Antiquity of Nations*, Cambridge, 2004. Bertold Spuler, "Iran: The Persistent Heritage," in G. E. von Grunebaum, ed. *Unity and Variety in Muslim Civilization*, Chicago, 1955. pp. 167-82. S. M. Stern, "Ya'qub the Coppersmith and Persian National Sentiment," in Edmund Bosworth, ed., *Iran and Islam: In Memory of the Late Vladimir Minorsky*, Edinburgh, 1971, pp. 535-56. ʿAbd-al-Raḥim Ṭālebof, *Safina-ye ṭālebi*, 2 vols., Istambul, 1311/1895. M. Tavakoli-Targhi, *Refashioning Iran: Orientalism, Occidentalism and Historiography*, New York, 2001. Wezārat-e farhang wa eršād-e Eslāmi, *Arzešhā wa negarešhā-ye Irāniān* (Iranian values and orientations), Tehran, 2002. Donald Wilber, *Riza Shah Pahlavi: The Resurrection and Reconstruction of Iran*, New York, 1975. Ehsan Yarshater, "Were the Sasanians Heirs to the Achaemenids?" in *La Persia nel Medioevo*, Rome, 1971, pp. 517-31. Idem, "Čerā dar Šāh-nāma az pādšāhān-e Mād wa Haḵāmaneši ḏekri nist?" *Iran Nameh/Irān-nāma* 3/2, 1984, pp. 191-213.

(AHMAD ASHRAF)

v. IN THE POST-REVOLUTIONARY ERA
See Supplement online.

IRANIAN STUDIES. See under the names of individual countries and universities.

IRANIAN STUDIES. See SOCIETY FOR IRANIAN STUDIES.

IRAN-NAMEH, a journal of Oriental studies, founded in Yerevan, Armenia, in May 1993 by Garnik S. Asatrian as a scholarly monthly publication in Armenian language, dealing with various issues of the Oriental world in general, Persia in particular. As the first academic publication of such a character, not only in the Caucasian region, but also in the republics of the former Soviet Union, *Iran-nameh* was welcomed and duly appreciated by the academic circles in the West as well. Thirty-eight issues have been published since then. The first thirteen issues were in 20 to 24 pages, but the following ones appeared as joint quarterly volumes with 100 to 120 pages each until 1999. Then *Iran-nameh* became an annual journal and contained also contributions in Russian in a separate section named "Russian Pages." In 1996 the *Journal* was incorporated into the framework of the Cau-