

Dissidence from a Distance

Iranian Politics as Viewed from Colonial Daghestan

Rebecca Ruth Gould

Unlike many modern nation-states and the regions they comprise, the Caucasus is defined neither by a single language nor by its affiliation to a single ethnicity or religion, but rather by its multiplicity. As a marginalized crossroads at the intersection of several imperial formations, the Caucasus is distinguished by the multilingual and multiconfessional identities that have developed within its ambit, as well as by its resistance to the kind of homogeneous narrative that characterizes the logic of nation-states. From the Sasanians to the 'Abbasids to the Mongols, to the Ottomans, Safavids, and Qajars, each empire that annexed or occupied this region shaped local literary production, in Persian, Arabic, and several Turkic languages, including Azeri, Qumyq, and Nogai. One of the distinctive features of the Caucasus is that, without ever being dominated by a single tradition, the many genres and texts that were authored on its terrain shaped multiple transnational literary traditions, including Persian, Arabic, and various Turkic literatures. This heterogeneous genealogy of influence applies above all to Persian, which generated a milieu, termed Persographic by Nile Green in the introduction to this volume, that transcended imperial borders. Indeed, it might be argued that the Caucasus, like much of South Asia, illustrates the broad divergence between the Persophone (Persian as a spoken language) and the Persographic (Persian as a written language), which this volume is uniquely suited to reveal.

For most of history, the Caucasus was not formally part of any Persian or Persianate dynasty (the Shirvanshahs, vassals of the Saljuqs, are one exception). Nonetheless, it has frequently been considered the northernmost periphery of the Persographic world. Yet, in the Caucasus, geographic peripherality has often coexisted with cultural centrality. Home to several centers of Persian literary production, including Shirvan, Ganja, and Derbent, the Caucasus has played a unique role in shaping Persian literary history. Nizami (d. 1209), whose cycle of literary romances (*masnawis*) were to become among the most frequently imitated works across the Persianate world, produced these works from his home in Ganja, not

far from the Georgian border. In his prodigious confrontational verses, Khaqani of Shirvan (d. 1191) similarly depicted a sensibility that could only have been articulated by a poet who had come of age along imperial borderlands, and whose understanding of Islam was profoundly shaped by his contact with Christian culture. Entire genres, such as the prison poem, which Khaqani pioneered, were the product of a subaltern identity formed on the margins of empires and at a crossroads of cultures.¹

The unique status of Persian as a language of writing in the Caucasus meant that the process whereby colonial modernity replaced what in chapter 12 of this volume Abbas Amanat calls the “once thriving sociocultural sphere that stretched from Khotan to Sarajevo and from Tbilisi to Mysore” did not follow the same trajectory as its gradual demise elsewhere. Although never wholly hegemonic, Persian continued to shape literary culture across the Caucasus even after much of the region was incorporated into the Russian Empire. Persian in the Caucasus was fragmented from the very beginning; it never encompassed the entirety of literary culture. Yet the fragmented, graphic status of this literary language in a geography wherein it was rarely spoken may have helped to keep its ethos alive in the Caucasus amid the rise of national identities. Far from representing a tradition that was being erased, Persian inflected all of the major literatures of the Caucasus, from Georgian to Armenian to Azeri. Even when Persian was overtaken in early modernity by Turkic and indigenous languages as the primary medium of literary culture, its historical role in creating a cohesive literary culture, woven together by common themes, tropes, genres, and narratives, persisted up to and after the Russian revolution.

Standard histories of Persian literature concentrate on the Caucasus during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, but the influence of the Caucasus on the Persian literary imagination did not end with Nizami and Khaqani or the literary genres these poets pioneered (the *masnawi* and the *qasida*, respectively). As a result of Safavid deportations to regions around Isfahan of Georgian and Armenian communities, begun by Shah ‘Abbas I (r. 1588–1629), Iranian culture continued to be shaped by literary production in the Caucasus, and in new ways.² Whereas Saljuq-era experiments in Persian poetics primarily involved textual transmission from the periphery to the center, Safavid-era literary production in Persian travelled in the opposite direction. Georgian kings such as Teimuraz I of Kakheti (r. 1605–16, 1625–48), who came of age in Isfahan and was buried in Astarabad, used their training in Persian poetics to develop a new Persianate canon for Georgian literature.³

One consequence of the Safavid practice of having Georgians regularly serve as slaves (*ghulam*) of the shah was to enable extensive intermingling between Iranian rulers and non-Iranian subjects.⁴ As Said Amir Arjomand has pointed out, “the mothers of all the Safavid shahs from Shah Safi I (r. 1629–42) onward were Georgians.”⁵ Equally salient is the fact that “the longest-serving grand vizier under

Sultan Husayn, Fath-‘Ali Khan Daghistani (in office 1715–20), was a self-proclaimed Sunni who hailed from the tribal, fervently Sunni region of Daghestan.⁷⁶ As a result of the extensive presence of Georgians at the Safavid court, Georgian intermingled with Persian in the harems of Isfahan, and Safavid shahs grew up hearing this language. For the first time in the literary history of the Caucasus, under Safavid rule, Georgian poets passed much of their life within the borders of Iran. Iran went from being an imaginary geography in Caucasus literary history to being an ever-present, oppressive political reality. Safavid Iran could not be idealized, but, as a matter of political exigency, it had to be engaged. The Safavid court continued the tradition of exchange between the literary culture of Iran and the Caucasus from prior eras, but these new, early modern contacts could not be extracted from the broader coercive dynamics of Safavid rule.

Intermingling did not take place to this degree in earlier eras, not least because Tbilisi and Shirvan were centers of power in their own right, and Georgian rulers had no reason to reside in Iranian capitals such as Isfahan and Shiraz. With the weakening of Georgian sovereignty in the early modern era and the collapse of centralized rule in the Caucasus, the center-periphery relation changed. Rather than expanding outward, as Saljuq and Ghaznavid sultans had done, the Safavid shahs evinced a “relative lack of expansionist zeal . . . [and] never sought to extend their dominion far beyond the plateau.”⁷⁷ Safavid rulers preferred to focus on stabilizing their immediate domains rather than engaging in wars of conquest and expansion. This meant cultivating literary culture closer to home, and pursuing a relatively insular approach to literary patronage. Yet Safavid rulers’ lack of expansionist zeal did not mean that they were not guided by an imperial design. Rather, their imperial agenda prioritized securing the borders of the Safavid Empire rather than extending them. In order to achieve this goal, millions of Georgians and Armenians were deported to the environs of Isfahan. In making Iran their new home, the deportees often applied the names of the villages they had been forced to abandon to their new abodes. Hence the paucity of conquests of the Caucasus during the Safavid period was compensated for by mass deportations, the emptying out of the Caucasus, and the incorporation of deported Georgians and Armenians into Safavid Iran. In the early modern Persianate world, the expansionist Saljuq state was replaced by the Safavids’ aggressive assimilation.

By the late nineteenth century, in the late stages of Qajar rule (1785–1925), aggressive assimilation had given way to a different dynamic. Now that the geopolitical center of gravity had shifted dramatically westward, official policy focused on the imitation of, and rivalry with, an ascendant Europe, as well as with the Ottoman Empire. Reform, revolution, liberty, equality, and constitutionalism were the keywords of this age. Literary culture reflected this shift. Poetry gave way to prose, and the imaginative stories about times past that had structured Nizami’s medieval romances were replaced by political polemics, including castigations of the Qajar regime and calls for limiting the power of the sovereign and introducing

new political forms through which the will of the people could be realized. For Qajar-era writers, being political meant engaging with the classical categories of European liberalism, and seeking to reform Islam along these lines, rather than praising the ruling regime.

MIGRATORY IDENTITIES IN THE CAUCASUS

Even when nineteenth-century Persian literary production in the Caucasus shifted away from poetry to engage with other genres, many of them in prose, Persian never ceased to figure heavily in the literatures of the Caucasus. The annexation of much of Georgia and Azerbaijan by the Russian Empire in the early nineteenth century, especially following the Treaty of Gulistan (1813), introduced a new orientation to print culture. These decades witnessed a proliferation of serial publications that circulated across the Ottoman, Mughal, and Russian empires, such as *Habl al-Matin* (The Strong Cord, 1893 to 1930), published in Calcutta, and the even more influential *Mulla Nasr al-Din* (1906–31), published first in Tbilisi, subsequently in Tabriz, and finally in Baku, as censors successively sought to bring its existence to a halt.⁸ Eventually banned in Iran, *Mulla Nasr al-Din* reached Iranian readers by being smuggled in along with cloth and other merchandise.⁹ In shaping what Nile Green has called the Persianate world’s “paper modernity,” this serial print culture, much of which originated in the Caucasus and Central Asia, greatly contributed to the spread of the ideas that inspired the Iranian Constitutional Revolution.¹⁰

The new print culture that these publications inspired and sustained was largely the creation of a merchant class that was increasingly detached from the ‘*ulama*. Across Central Asia and the Caucasus, the publishers and contributors to these publications participated in an intellectual movement that sought to carve out a new sphere for public debate through the reform of the education system and the development of print culture.¹¹ Throughout the Russian empire, these reformers led the way in creating a new class of intellectuals, many of whom had religious educations but who chose to write for the general public rather than the ‘*ulama*. Until recently, the general consensus in Central Asian history has been that “jadidism as a reformist project would have been inconceivable without the printing press, for the printed word allowed the Jadids to challenge the moral authority of the established rural elite, the *ulema*.”¹² More recent years have witnessed a critical approach to this narrative, with Devin DeWeese, Paolo Sartori, and others challenging the binary opposition between the Jadid reformers and the ‘*ulama*.¹³

Much like the Russian intelligentsia, individuals from the emergent social class that fostered the development of Persian print culture often had merchant backgrounds and worked in multiple languages. They were cosmopolitan in temperament, vocation, and biography. In some respects they resembled their predecessors from earlier centuries, except that these new figures choose prose, rather than

poetry, as their medium of choice. Their writing engaged with the debates of the time, and drew heavily on the European Enlightenment, as mediated by Russian sources, and with substantive admixtures of Indian and Ottoman learning.¹⁴ The reading publics they cultivated extended across the Caucasus and in many cases deep into Central Asia, all the way to South Asia. Often migrants to the Caucasus, these intellectuals, who were variously Iranian, Turkic, and mixtures of other ethnicities, made their home in the Caucasus, a region known for its ethnic and confessional diversity. The work these intellectuals produced reflects their intersecting migratory identities.

The impact of the Jadids of the Russian empire, in particular the Caucasus, on political developments within Iran harkens back to a pre-Safavid dialectic of center/periphery relations, whereby intellectual developments on the edges of the Persianate world came to be seen as the standard toward which Iranian intellectuals should aspire. Although the differences are so incommensurable as to preclude most reasonable comparison, Muslim reformers of this era in the Caucasus and the Saljuq-era poets had in common the fact that their learning was in many respects more cosmopolitan than that of their counterparts within Iran. Like the twelfth-century poets, Muslim reformers of the nineteenth-century Caucasus were luminaries of their age. Also like the earlier poets in and around the Saljuq court and their vassals, the Shirvanshahs, they were attentive to developments in Iran. There was also a demographic dimension to this connection, given that Iranians were the largest diasporic group in the Russian empire and most members of this diaspora resided in the Caucasus.

Coming to terms with Persian literature in the Caucasus after the Russian annexation means engaging with the particular kind of modernity that these political shifts and technological transformations fostered. Writers' global affiliations shifted during these years, with the introduction of rapid forms of communication such as the telegraph and the transregional networks that traversed new political boundaries. Moscow, Tbilisi, Baku, Tehran, Tabriz, Yerevan, and Tashkent became linked in hitherto unforeseen ways. In some instances, new alliances brought about linguistic shifts, including an increased use of Russian as a language of communication. In other instances, global realignments instead offered new frameworks for engaging with local traditions that were articulated in forms that were predominantly Persographic (including Persian as well as Persian-influenced forms). As had been the case for centuries, Persian functioned temporally as well as spatially to create mobile communities of readers who collectively engaged with the future of Islam, educational reform, and the challenges of modernity.

Thanks in part to exchanges between Russian, Iranian, Georgian, and Azeri writers, the Caucasus was a center for many cultural flows during the nineteenth century. Writers such as 'Abbas Quli Agha Bakikhanuf (1794–1847) and Mirza Fath 'Ali Akhundzada (1812–1878) each passed some of their lives in Tbilisi, the cultural capital of the Caucasus and a meeting place for writers, intellectuals, publishers,

and merchants from Iran, Azerbaijan, and Armenia. When writers gathered in Tbilisi, their native ties to Iran, Azerbaijan, and Armenia intermingled, linguistically and politically, with new cosmopolitan identities. Through such assimilative processes, nineteenth-century Persian literature in the Caucasus became heterogeneous and resistant to attempts from Tehran to make Persian isomorphic with the Qajar state. Immersed as it was in advancing social transformation, the Persian literature of the nineteenth-century Caucasus—of Bakikhanuf and Akhundzada—was commensurately global in its imagination. Instead of the cities that had been centers of Persianate culture under the Ghaznavids and Saljuqs (namely, Ghazna, Lahore, Shirvan, and Ganja), the nineteenth-century centers of Persographic culture outside Iranian borders were Tbilisi, Baku, and Istanbul. Although Persian was not the official language in any of these cities, each of them nurtured a culture that was broadly Persianate. In each city, too, newspapers and journals banned in Iran were published and distributed. Hence, without being formally part of Iran, each of these cities has a central place in the history of Persian literature.

The remainder of this chapter focuses on an intellectual whose work and life epitomize the cultural and political flows that characterize the periphery/center relation instituted by Qajar rule. It brings together a perspective on the long history of Persian literature across the centuries with specific attention to the shaping of this imagination by currents in Russian political life and intellectual history. In many cases, these currents were mediated to Iran from Europe via Russia. It therefore responds, albeit schematically, to Ali Ansari's recent query, addressed to those who wish to reconstruct the intellectual history of the Iranian Constitutional Revolution: "If . . . as we know, a rich flow of intellectual traffic came via Russia, to what extent did Russian intellectualism affect the interpretation and transmission of those texts?"¹⁵ In the writings of Mirza 'Abd al-Rahim Talibuf (1834–1911) we can better perceive both the trajectory of the Iranian enlightenment and the shaping influence on Iranian modernity of Russian ideas and the environment of the Caucasus.

'ABD AL-RAHIM TALIBUF: A BRIEF BIOGRAPHY

Born in the Iranian city of Tabriz, Talibuf was part of the wave of Iranian migrants who travelled north in search of greater economic opportunity as well as new intellectual horizons. As Hassan Hakimian has demonstrated, migration from Iran to the Russian empire, primarily to the Caucasus between 1880 and 1914, was unprecedented in scope and scale.¹⁶ Indeed, existing data suggests that Iranians may have been "the largest group of foreign subjects in the Russian Empire."¹⁷ Talibuf's trajectory fits into the demographic captured in the Russian Imperial Census of 1897, which recorded 73,920 Persian-speaking migrants throughout Russia, 60,405 of whom resided in the Caucasus. Roughly 17,000 of these Persian-speakers resided in Baku; 6,000 in Tbilisi; and just over 1,000 in Daghestan, where Talibuf



FIGURE 14. Across imperial frontiers: 'Abd al-Rahim Talibuf. Undated photograph by an unknown photographer in Talibuf, *Azadi u Siyasat*, ed. Iraj Afshar (Tehran, 1978), unnumbered plate.

was living when the census was completed.¹⁸ Unlike Bakikhanuf and Akhundzada, Talibuf was not native to the Caucasus; like the migrants studied by Hakimian, he travelled to Tbilisi from Tabriz in search of a new life. He did well for himself in Tbilisi and stayed behind, eventually relocating to Daghestan, where he blended into the local community, dedicated himself to writing, and quickly became a successor to the Persianate reformist tradition pioneered by Bakikhanuf and Akhundzada.

Within Iran, the Caucasus, and globally, the second half of the nineteenth century was an era of monumental changes. The fragmenting Russian and Qajar empires were both giving rise to new political formations, especially in the Caucasus. Geographically and temporally, Jadids of the Russian empire were both influenced by and influential on the revolutions that took place both to the north and to the south. From Tabriz to Tbilisi to Temir Khan Shura (at that time the capital of Daghestan, then a province of the Russian Empire), Persophone intellectuals were at the forefront of efforts to rethink the meanings of liberty, freedom, and political legitimacy in terms that could have traction within Muslim society. Bakikhanuf presided over the first generation of these intellectuals, who were ethnically Turkic but wrote primarily in Persian.¹⁹ Akhundzada, another Azeri writer and thinker whose works attained notoriety in Iran, presided over the second generation. Although he migrated to the Caucasus late in life, in light of his prodigious output and significant influence on local intellectual life, Talibuf was among the most prominent figures in the third generation of Persianate thinkers that shaped intellectual life both within Iranian borders and throughout the Caucasus.

Talibuf's biography differs from those of his predecessors Bakikhanuf and Akhundzada, whose direct contact with Iran ranged from minimal to nonexistent. Born in Iran, he interacted directly with leading Iranian intellectuals during his lifetime. During the decades in which he resided in Temir Khan Shura, Iranian intellectuals undertook pilgrimages to see him. The poet Yahya Dawlatabadi, whose memoirs exhibit a broad fascination with the Caucasus, travelled to Daghestan to visit him.²⁰ Talibuf corresponded with the lexicographer, poet, and social critic 'Ali Akbar Dihkhuda (1879–1956) and other influential supporters of the Iranian Constitutional Revolution of 1905. He met the Iranian diplomat Hasan Taqizada (1878–1970) in person when the latter came to see him in Baku.²¹

In perhaps the strongest sign of his influence on the Iranian revolution, Talibuf was selected as a deputy to the first Iranian parliament (1906–8). To the surprise of his many readers, after having acquired such respect from his countrymen, Talibuf refused to travel to Tehran, even when invited to do so. He preferred to observe the revolution that he had inspired from afar. Whether out of principle or simply through historical happenstance, Talibuf practiced dissidence from a distance. Various reasons have been suggested for Talibuf's refusal to travel to Iran to take up a position in the parliament, but the most persuasive one has been given by the literary historian Yahya Aryanpur: having been declared *persona non grata*

by the *'ulama*, and indeed labeled an infidel (*kafir*) within Iran, Talibuf was not eager to return to a country where his books had been condemned.²² Furthermore, his critical orientation may have benefitted from the distance he maintained between himself and the political turbulence of the era. Iraj Parsinijad for one has argued that Talibuf regarded literary criticism as a means of engaging with the social and political tribulations of his time.²³

Bakikhanuf and Akhundzada were both born in what was to become during their lifetimes Russian (rather than Iranian) Azerbaijan. By contrast, Talibuf was born in Iranian Azerbaijan, in Tabriz, to a family of carpenters (hence his full name Mirza 'Abd al-Rahim Talibi Najjar Tabrizi). At the age of sixteen, he left Tabriz for Tbilisi, where he worked for the Iranian merchant Muhammad 'Ali Khan, who made a fortune from obtaining concessions for the construction of roads and bridges across the Caucasus.²⁴ In Tbilisi, Talibuf also continued his studies. His education surely included Russian, a language that made many new European thinkers accessible to him, as it did for Akhundzada. An undated photograph reproduced in his own book *Azadi u Siyasat* (Freedom and Politics) shows Talibuf wearing the traditional Caucasian cloak (*chokha*) and having fully assimilated to local fashion.

A HOME AWAY FROM HOME: TEMIR KHAN SHURA

Talibuf's choice of permanent home was even more perplexing than his sudden departure from Tabriz to Tbilisi. Unlike the majority of Iranian migrants, Talibuf did not settle in cosmopolitan Baku, Tbilisi, Shirvan, or even Ganja, where he would have been surrounded by Persophone intellectuals who shared his reformist proclivities. Rather, he settled in the provincial capital of Daghestan, Temir Khan Shura (renamed Buynaksk in 1922), located on the other side of the Caucasus mountains, where he joined a community of only three and a half thousand speakers of Persian. Postcards of the time reveal Temir Khan Shura as a city that combined traditional ways of life with gestures towards urban planning along European lines. Another series of images collected by the American explorer and diplomat George Kennan (1904–2005) reveal urban boulevards intersecting with Oriental bazaars creating the impression of a city on the brink of a major transformation.²⁵

While residing in Temir Khan Shura, Talibuf married a Daghestani woman with whom he had a daughter. He lived in Daghestan with his family until the end of his life, writing books and amassing what was probably Daghestan's most significant library of Persian writings, which became a resource well known to local intellectuals. During these years Talibuf also founded Temir Khan Shura's first girl's gymnasium, where, in true reformist fashion, a combination of secular intellectuals, *'ulama*, and reformist Muslims taught. As a philanthropist who contributed intensively to the welfare of his community, Talibuf's grave in Temir Khan Shura is replete with elaborate Quranic inscriptions to this day.

Although, like all of Daghestan, Temir Khan Shura is recognized for its formative role in the intellectual history of Russian Islam, its relevance to Iranian history and Persian culture is less known.²⁶ For Daghestani intellectuals, however, the city, which was named after the Turco-Mongol conqueror Timur (Tamerlane) who stayed there in 1396, was an important center for Muslim reform movements during and after Talibuf's lifetime. One of the most important of this city's legacies is the Islamic publishing house founded by another influential reformer, Muhammad Mirza Mavraev (Mawrayuf) (1878–1964) in 1903, during the height of Talibuf's literary activities, two years before the beginning of the Iranian Constitutional Revolution, and three years before the first issue of the journal *Mulla Nasr al-Din*.

Mavraev's was among the first publishing house in the Caucasus to specialize in publishing in Arabic-script languages, including those of Daghestan. The publishing house of Mavraev (transliterated into Arabic script as Mawrayuf) released many hundreds of books in Arabic. These comprised classical Islamic texts as well as many works by Daghestani scholars in local Turkic and indigenous Arabic-script languages.²⁷ Hundreds of volumes were also published in other languages, including Qumyq, Avar, Dargin, Chechen, Azeri, Karachai, Kabardin, and Ossetian, all in Arabic and Persian scripts. Although he initially printed his books in the simplified and less curvaceous *naskh* script in order to approximate modern print, these books sold badly, and their publication brought Mavraev to the verge of bankruptcy. Only when Mavraev turned to lithographs, a form of facsimile reproduction that most closely approximated manuscripts, was he able to make a profit.²⁸ This same pattern of readerly reception, and preference for lithographs over books printed according to the latest technology, has been recognized across Islamic lands, including in Central Asia, where the curvaceous *nast'aliq* script "allowed script to continue under the guise of print," and hence to preserve a semblance of continuity with the manuscript age while also attaining commercial success.²⁹ That Talibuf (and Mavraev initially) preferred the simpler *naskh* script reflect their modernizing tendencies.

Although he was evidently inspired by the intellectual ferment that centered around Mavraev's activities, Talibuf chose to work with publishers outside Daghestan who could guarantee his works a wider reception than Mavraev could have done. He therefore published his books in Tbilisi, Grozny, Tehran, Istanbul, and Cairo, in editions printed in the *naskh* script. But the intellectual activity that was stimulated by this first Daghestani publishing house, which enabled local writers to see their works printed for the first time, and acquainted Muslim readers with the classics of Islamic learning in accessible format, left a mark on this transplanted Iranian reformer.

More direct evidence regarding the wide recognition Talibuf attained within Daghestan is offered by an Arabophone Daghestani intellectual, who was fluent in Persian although he wrote mostly in Arabic and Azeri. Almost his exact contemporary,

Hasan al-Alqadari (1834–1910) was born the same year as Talibuf and passed away only months before his death. They shared much more in common than their biographical chronology. Like Talibuf, al-Alqadari was multilingual, and fluent in Arabic, Azeri, and Persian. In contrast to Talibuf, al-Alqadari wrote primarily in Arabic, which was not his native tongue. The parallels between these two Daghestanis, one native-born and the other transplanted from Iran, suggest how Arabic and Persian productively interacted in this multilingual linguistic geography.

Arguably the most important Daghestani jurist, poet, and historian of the twentieth century, and regarded by many as a forerunner of the Jadid movement that would soon transform intellectual life across Muslim Russia and the Ottoman Empire, al-Alqadari dedicated to Talibuf two odes (*qasidas*) in his autobiographical Arabic-language collection of poetry and prose, *Diwan al-Mamnun*. Although this work was published by Mavraev/Mawrayuf in 1913, after al-Alqadari's death, it was composed in the 1890s, during which decade it circulated in manuscript form. Although the text is entirely in Arabic, at many points al-Alqadari deploys tools from the Persian literary repertoire, such as his pen name (*takhallus*), which means “thankful one [*amnun*].” Al-Alqadari references Talibuf in two places to thank him for his assistance in securing much-needed books for him.³⁰ In the expression of gratitude preceding the first of these *qasidas*, al-Alqadari refers to Talibuf as his spiritual grandfather (*al-jad al-ruhani*).³¹ Even though he was his exact contemporary, al-Alqadari felt compelled to defer to Talibuf when addressing him.

Another major Daghestani reformer who was fluent in Persian, Abu Sufiyan Akaev (1872–1931), from a somewhat younger generation, recollected passing many hours in Talibuf's library in Temir Khan Shura during his childhood, where he read Firdawsi's *Shah-nama* and other Persian classics.³² After returning from an extended sojourn in Egypt, where he impressed Rashid Rida (1865–1935) so much with his learning and ideas that the latter went on to write an article entitled “The Daghestani Awakening,” Akaev founded Daghestan's first school based on “new method” (*jadid*) principles.³³ This school may have been partly inspired by the gymnasium that Talibuf founded to support the instruction of girls. While none of these Daghestani thinkers, who circulated primarily within Arabic, Turkic, and Russian worlds, were directly involved with the Iranian Constitutional Revolution, their proximity to Talibuf brought them into indirect contact with the latest ideas coming from Iran. Although Persian, along with Turkish, was accessible to most of Talibuf's Azeri readers to the south, Daghestani readers in his immediate environment were more likely to read works in Arabic and various Turkic dialects. And yet, as the 1897 census showed, thousands of Persian speakers resided in Daghestan. Still, we might ask, why did Talibuf elect to pass his life, and elaborate his plea for Iranian Enlightenment, among Daghestanis who were unlikely to read his work? In light of these linguistic differences, the close connections Talibuf cultivated with Daghestani reformists who were more likely to write for Turkic, Arabic, and Russian audiences is all the more striking.

IDEAS AND TEXTS

In his recent study of Talibuf's theory of liberty, Mehran Mazinani notes that the most influential and progressive Iranian thinkers passed the majority of their adult lives outside the borders of Iran.³⁴ During these same years, the Iranian diplomat Mirza Malkum Khan (1833–1908), whose writings similarly influenced the trajectory of the Constitutional Revolution, was observing events within Iran from afar, first in London and subsequently as Iran's ambassador to Italy.³⁵ Akhundzada remained safely within the borders of Russian Azerbaijan while he penned his biting satires of Persian and Muslim culture. Only twice in his life did he travel to Iran.³⁶ Talibuf's biography conforms to this pattern of dissidence from a distance that features frequently in Iranian intellectual history, and indeed in the intellectual history of many empires with politically influential diasporas. By situating themselves on the margins of imperial formations, writers gain a unique vantage point on their own societies, and acquire a capacity for critique that eludes those who operate closer to the centers of power. Hence, the emergence of the concept of critique in nineteenth-century Persian literature is coeval with the tendency of writers critical of sovereign power to settle in a physical space far away from the regime.³⁷ This may help to explain why certain forms of Persian literary criticism flourished in the Caucasus even more than within the borders of Iran. The polemical writings of Akhundzada strikingly exemplify this trend.

Particularly in the decades leading up to the Constitutional Revolution, Persophone intellectuals who were most forthrightly critical of the state were most productive while residing outside the borders of Qajar Iran. In further evidence of this pattern, Talibuf's own framing of his life suggests that remaining far from Tabriz, where he was born, and Tehran, the center of Iranian power, was a deliberate choice. Reflecting on the benefits of exile, Talibuf wrote in 1908, just after the dissolution of the first Iranian parliament, "although there are critics and satirists more talented than I, located as I am, distant from my homeland, I do not fear to write the truth."³⁸ In his own eyes, Talibuf's physical location in the Caucasus was central to his claim to originality. A few years earlier, contrasting his position to that of his more politically ambitious contemporaries, Talibuf had declared on the opening pages of his *Masalik al-Muhsinin* (Ways of the Righteous, 1905), a fictional travelogue interspersed with philosophical and literary-critical digressions: "I am not an Iranian tycoon [and I] . . . strongly oppose injustice; I seek neither power nor titles."³⁹ Informed by his merchant background, Talibuf reconfigured this relation to capital as a tool for the critique and moderation of sovereign rule. His words testify to an emergent bourgeois consciousness among the Iranian intellectual elite. For Talibuf, as for so many of his contemporaries, distance from Iran was a precondition for effective social critique. Exile from Iran enabled Talibuf to articulate his vision of a just social order within Iran.

Having made most of his income while working as a merchant in Tbilisi, Talibuf did not begin publishing books until he reached the age of fifty-eight. His first

book, *Nukhba-i Sipihri* (Best of the Spheres, 1892), was a biography of the Prophet Muhammad, which he first published in Istanbul and, a decade later, in Grozny in his own translation into Russian.⁴⁰ An autodidact whose knowledge was acquired in the politically peripheral locations of Tabriz and Tbilisi rather than Tehran, Istanbul, and Cairo, Talibuf published eight books during the last two decades of his life. These were eclectic and aphoristic reflections, written in an accessible style, on the major political and philosophical issues of his day, ranging from child-rearing, to educational reform, to political sovereignty and the distribution of power.

Alongside his original writings, which constitute the bulk of his oeuvre, Talibuf translated three books. Each of the translations was done from Russian, even when the original texts were in Greek and French, which returns us to Ansari's query concerning the extent to which "Russian intellectualism affect[ed] the interpretation and transmission" of European texts. One such example is his *Hayat-i Jadid* (New Astronomy, 1894), which was largely a translation of a treatise on astronomy by the French writer Camille Flammarion (1842–1925).⁴¹ Another is Marcus Aurelius's *Meditations*, which Talibuf Persianized by situating it within the classical genre of advice literature (*pand-nama*).⁴² Talibuf also composed poetry with a strongly political orientation that was praised by the firebrand Iranian critic Ahmad Kasrawi (1890–1946).⁴³

In the preface to his Russian translation of *Nukhba-yi Sipihri*, Talibuf explained that he wanted to make available to Muslim students within the Russian empire his "short history of the life of the Prophet and his teachings, and to provide Muslims, without regard to sectarian differences, instruction to which no Muslim scholar or European orientalist could object."⁴⁴ At the same time, Talibuf hoped with this translation of his life of the Prophet to give the Russian reader "a brief source for becoming acquainted with the history of Islam." Hence Talibuf's reformist agenda was directed to the many different constituencies to which his works circulated: to readers of Persian residing throughout the Persianate world, including of course Iran, who were interested in the latest advances in European thought, to Russophone Muslims of the Russian Empire of all sectarian, cultural, and linguistic backgrounds, and to Russians, for whom Islam was a foreign religion in their midst, concerning which they wished to know more.

STYLE AND FORM

Having examined the context and reception of Talibuf's writing, this chapter concludes by briefly considering its style and form, which also sets him apart from his contemporaries within and outside Iran. In stylistic terms, one feature that sets Talibuf's writing apart from his predecessors such as Akhundzada and Bakikhanuf is the simplicity of his language. It was due to this simplicity that the Russian Persianist E. Bertel's classed Talibuf's *Kitab-i Ahmad* (Book of Ahmad, 1893) as written within the rubric of children's literature in imitation of Jean-Jacques

Rousseau's *Émile* (1762). Talibuf's simple style conceals a complex literary strategy, as well as unmatched clarity of thought. As he explained in the preface to *Masalik al-Muhsinin*, Talibuf preferred simplicity of prose and had little use for excessive flourishes in language.⁴⁵

Much like Akhundzada and to a lesser extent Bakikhanuf, Talibuf took a particular interest in foreign, particularly European, sources. With both thinkers, however, their engagement with European writers was multifarious and never directed exclusively at Europe. Akhundzada combined an interest in European enlightenment thinkers with an idealized account of pre-Islamic Persia and of Zoroastrianism before Islam.⁴⁶ Instead of celebrating the ancient past, Talibuf directed his attention to political transformations under way elsewhere in the world during his lifetime. *Masa'il al-Hayat* (Questions of Life, 1906), Talibuf's most detailed meditation on the different forms of government and the types of sovereignty appropriate to them, concluded with an extended translation from Japan's Meiji Constitution of 1868.⁴⁷ As a country that had emerged triumphant over a major European empire during the Russo-Japanese War (1904–5), and which had also creatively appropriated the most recent advances in European civilization, Japan for Talibuf and many like-minded Iranian thinkers represented a model for Iran to follow, of a non-European country that adopted the best practices of European empires without becoming subservient to them. The epic poem *Mikadu-nama* (Book of the Mikado, 1907) by Mirza Husayn-'Ali Tajir Shirazi, written to congratulate the "Emperor of the Sun and the Japanese people in the aftermath of Japan's victory," over Russia and discussed in Abbas Amanat's chapter, belongs to this same tradition.⁴⁸ Neither Talibuf nor Shirazi criticizes the Meiji Constitution's close relationship to the Prussian model.⁴⁹ They therefore miss the link between nationalist revivals and authoritarian governance. Focusing instead on the Meiji Restoration as a political process to emulate, Talibuf promoted the Meiji Constitution in his translation and in the commentary that accompanied it as a means of inspiring his readers to learn from modern methods of governance, and to advocate for a political system based on constitutional rights.

Like many of his predecessors, and particularly Akhundzada, Talibuf relies on pastiche as a literary method. He associates Voltaire with the claim that "complete sovereignty is contrary to nature."⁵⁰ Numerous passages from Sa'di's *Gulistan* also populate his work, including the first page of his collected teachings, *Siyasat-i Talibi* (Talibuf's Politics), where quotations from Sa'di frame a photograph of himself. These citations elide distinctions in culture and chronology as they amalgamate the world's learning into a universal repository. Finally, Talibuf resembles Akhundzada in his strategic deployment of techniques derived from fictional literary narrative throughout his nonfiction. Among Akhundzada's most famous works is *Maktubat* (Letters), an epistolary exchange between a fictional Mughal prince and an equally fictional Qajar ruler. Talibuf's nonfiction similarly deploys fictional devices, such as a father addressing his son in his *Kitab-i Ahmad* or his fictional travelogue *Masalik al-Muhsinin*.

Like Akhundzada, whose *Maktubat* was published with a special lexicon of foreign words for progressive ideas, and his fellow exile Mirza Malkum Khan, Talibuf's Persian overflows with a borrowed European lexicon, even in contexts where Persian words could have been used.⁵¹ Terms like *qanun*, *impiratur*, and *diplumasi* suffuse Talibuf's prose, as if the repeated invocation of European keywords could facilitate the reception of European ideas within Islamic and Iranian thought.⁵²

CONCLUSIONS

Talibuf's legacy is important for, among other reasons, the pressure it puts on us to rethink the circulation of knowledge between Russia and Iran during the early twentieth century. As Moritz Deutschmann has argued, "Although the Russo-Iranian border in the early twentieth century was not a serious obstacle to contacts between Iran and the South Caucasus . . . the border did start to have an impact on the field of politics in the region" during the second half of the nineteenth century.⁵³ The Constitutional Revolution was a turning point in this progressive transformation of border identities. The outcome of the revolution that Talibuf observed from afar is well known, but the vision that motivated it has broader implications for the study of Islamic modernism and the role of diasporic constituencies in shaping intellectual history. Across the Russian empire, the decades leading up to the 1905 revolution were a period of tremendous intellectual ferment. The same questions that were being asked in Iran during those years by Persian writers such as Talibuf were also asked by Daghestani reformers in Arabic, Azeri, and other languages of the Russian empire. The groundwork for posing many of these questions had been laid by Bakikhanuf and Akhundzada in prior decades.

To varying degrees, each reformer within this Persianate world reconceptualized the place of Islam in modernity along lines inaugurated by thinkers like Jamal al-Din al-Afghani (1838–97), although they had their disagreements, of course, with this pioneer of modern Islamic thought. While their Iranian counterparts worked to develop parliamentary forms of governance that incorporated classical liberal principles of the division of powers, Muslims of the Russian Empire turned to the Islamic past to develop a Muslim-majority society grounded in the rule of law and promising equality for all. Just as developments within Iran resonated with the reform movements that were transforming the Russian Empire during these years, the efforts of the Muslims of the Russian empire to create a new society should be considered with reference to the political transformations taking place in Iran during these same years, most notably the Constitutional Revolution.

In his efforts to introduce European learning as mediated by Russia to his Persian readers, Talibuf reveals a dimension of Russian-Iranian exchange that was too frequently submerged by the tense geopolitics that motivated Russia's generally obstructionist policies with respect to domestic politics in Iran. This extended to the bombardment of the first Iranian parliament (*majlis*), and to backing the shah

against the Constitutionalists, even to the point of inflicting violence and hanging revolutionaries.⁵⁴ Even as these state-perpetrated actions expressed geopolitical might and power, new forms of cross-border affiliation were developing among intellectuals on both sides of the Iranian-Russian border. Talibuf's oeuvre is one of the most significant instances of these cross-border activities.

Talibuf's incorporation of the European Enlightenment in its Russian iteration into the Persian canon bears the mark of interpretive traditions that developed within the Russian empire, many of which resonated with key insights of Jadidism. The heterogeneity of the Iranian Constitutional revolution itself, which was, as Iago Gocheleishvili notes, "multi-national and multi-ideological" has been vastly underestimated.⁵⁵ At the same time, the role of revolutionaries from the Caucasus, in particular Georgians, in shaping the events in Iran, was fraught with ambiguities. As Deutschmann has shown, non-Muslim revolutionaries from the Caucasus, particularly Georgians, imposed their own sense of civilizational superiority on the very Iranians whose constitutional rights they sought to defend.⁵⁶ Meanwhile, writers such as Talibuf remained by and large above the fray and rejected such hierarchies, even while they refrained from directly commenting on the events of the day. Amid the false dichotomies propagated by revolutionaries and reactionaries past and present, Talibuf's work, which evolved according to a time scale different from that of many of his contemporaries, clarifies that neither democracy nor constitutionalism can legitimately be claimed as the exclusive possession of any specific culture.

NOTES

This research has been supported by the European Union's Horizon 2020 Research and Innovation Programme under ERC-2017-STG [grant agreement no. 759346].

1. For the genre of the prison poem, see Rebecca Ruth Gould, "Wearing the Belt of Oppression: Khāqānī's Christian Qaṣīda and the Prison Poetry of Medieval Shirvān," *Journal of Persianate Studies* 9, 1 (2016): 19–44, and for the specific spatial coordinates of this genre, Gould, "The Geographies of 'Ajam: The Circulation of Persian Poetry from South Asia to the Caucasus," *Medieval History Journal* 18, 1 (2015): 87–119.

2. For the impact of these deportations on Armenians, see Edmund Herzig, "The Deportation of the Armenians in 1604–05 and Europe's Myth of Shah Abbas I," in *Persian and Islamic Studies in Honor of P. W. Avery*, ed. Charles Melville (Cambridge: Cambridge University Center for Middle Eastern Studies, 1991), 59–71.

3. Rebecca Ruth Gould, "Sweetening the Heavy Georgian Tongue: Jāmī in the Georgian-Persianate Ecumene," in *A Worldwide Literature: Jāmī (1414–1492) in the Dār al-Islām and Beyond*, ed. Thibaut d'Hubert and Alexandre Papas (Leiden: Brill, 2019), 802–832.

4. For Georgian slavery at the Safavid court, see Kathryn Babayan, Sussan Babaie, Ina Baghdiantz-McCabe, and Massumeh Farhad, *Slaves of the Shah: New Elites of Safavid Iran* (London: I. B. Tauris, 2004).

5. Said Amir Arjomand, "The Salience of Political Ethic in the Spread of Persianate Islam," *Journal of Persianate Studies* 1, 1 (2008): 5.

6. Rudi Mathee, "The Decline of Safavid Iran in Comparative Perspective," *Journal of Persianate Studies* 8 (2015): 298.
7. *Ibid.*, 295.
8. For a classic account of this print culture, see Edward G. Browne, *The Press and Poetry of Modern Persia* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1914), with a list of the major Persian journals on 1–153. More recently, see Yahya Aryanpur, *Az Saba ta Nima: Tarikh-i 150 Sal-i Adab-i Farsi*, 3 vols. (Tehran: Intisharat-i Zawwar, 1972–95; 2008–9), 2: 40–60.
9. Hasan Javadi, "Molla Nasreddin II. Political and Social Weekly," *Encyclopædia Iranica*, www.iranicaonline.org/articles/molla-nasreddin-ii-political-and-social-weekly.
10. Nile Green, "Paper Modernity? Notes on an Iranian Industrial Tour, 1818," *Iran: Journal of Persian Studies* 46 (2008): 277–84.
11. Scholarship on Jadidism is rapidly evolving, making it difficult to offer a definitive citation, but Adeb Khalid's *The Politics of Muslim Cultural Reform: Jadidism in Central Asia* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999) may still be regarded as a standard text.
12. Adeb Khalid, "Printing, Publishing, and Reform in Tsarist Central Asia," *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 26, 2 (1994): 188.
13. See Paolo Sartori, "It Was a Dark and Stagnant Night ('til the Jadids Brought the Light): Clichés, Biases, and False Dichotomies in the Intellectual History of Central Asia," 37–92; *id.*, "Ijtihād in Bukhara: Central Asian Jadidism and Local Genealogies of Cultural Change," 193–236; and other contributions to *Beyond Modernism: Rethinking Islam in Russia, Central Asia and Western China (19th–20th Centuries)*, special issue on Jadidism, *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient* 59, 1–2 (2016).
14. For a typology of the different elements that informed the thinking of this class of intellectuals, see Ali Gheissari, "Iran's Dialectic of the Enlightenment: Notes on Constitutional Experience and Conflicting Narratives of Modernity," in *Iran's Constitutional Revolution of 1906 and Narratives of the Enlightenment*, ed. Ali Ansari (London: Gingko Library, 2017).
15. Ali Ansari, "Introduction," in *Iran's Constitutional Revolution*, ed. *id.* Similarly highlighting the need for greater research focused on Iranian interactions with the Russian empire, Fariba Zarinebaf writes: "The opening of the Russian archives will shed light on a very important player in the constitutional revolution. That history is still to be written." See Fariba Zarinebaf, "From Istanbul to Tabriz: Modernity and Constitutionalism in the Ottoman Empire and Iran," *Comparative Studies of South Asia, Africa and the Middle East* 28, 1 (2008), 154n2.
16. Hassan Hakimian, "Wage Labor and Migration: Persian Workers in Southern Russia, 1880–1914," *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 17, 4 (1985): 443–62.
17. Moritz Deutschmann, "Cultures of Statehood, Cultures of Revolution: Caucasian Revolutionaries in the Iranian Constitutional Movement, 1906–1911," *Ab Imperio* 2 (2013): 170
18. See Hakimian, "Wage Labor and Migration," 445, table 1.
19. Rebecca Ruth Gould, "The Persianate Cosmology of Historical Inquiry in the Caucasus: 'Abbās Qulī Āghā Bākikhānūf's Cosmological Cosmopolitanism," *Comparative Literature* 71, 3 (forthcoming).
20. Yahya Dawlatbadi, *Tarikh-i Mu'asir, ya Hayat-i Yahya* (Tehran: Kitabhkhana-yi Ibn Sina, 1950–58), 112–14.
21. Iraj Afshar, *Zindagi-yi Tufani: Khatirat-i Sayyid Hasan Taqizada* (Costa Mesa, CA: Mazda, 1990), 26.
22. Yahya Aryanpur, *Az Saba ta Nima: Tarikh-i 150 Sal-i Adab-i Farsi* (Tehran: Intisharat-i Zawwar, 2008–9), 1: 287.
23. Iraj Parsinijad, "Talibuf-i Tabrizi," *Iranshinasi* 7, 3 (1990): 40.
24. For further details on Talibuf's biography, see M. Qazwini, "Talibuf Tabrizi," *Majala-yi Yadigar* 4, 5 (1327/1949): 86; Aryanpur, *Az Saba ta Nima*, vol. 1; and P.M. Alibekova, "Zhanrovye i idejno-khudozhestvennye osobennosti romana Abdurrahima Talibova 'Puti pravednyh'" (Kandidatskaia diss., Makhachkala, 1998).

25. See “Central Boulevard, Temir Khan Shura” and “Bazaar, Temir Khan Shura,” Slavic and East European Collections, New York Public Library, Digital Collections 187.

26. For a detailed history of Temir Khan Shura, see B. I. Gadzhiev, *Temir-Khan-Shura* (Makhachkala, Dagestan, Russian Federation: Izd. Dom ‘Dagestan, 2014).

27. Many of these volumes are catalogued in Milena Nurieva Osmanova, *Arabskaia pechatnaia kniga v Dagestane v kontse XIX–nachale XX veka* (Makhachkala, Dagestan, Russian Federation: Nauka Plius, 2006). Another Dagestan publisher who worked primarily with lithographs and used the *nast’aliq* script, Isma’il of Shulani (1867–1930), corresponded with Talibuf.

28. For the relation between different scripts and the new print culture, see K. K. Walther, “Die lithographische Vervielfältigung von Texten in den Ländern des Vorderen und Mittleren Orients,” *Gutenberg-Jahrbuch* 65 (1990): 223–36.

29. Khalid, “Printing, Publishing, and Reform,” 192.

30. Hasan al-Alqadari, *Diwan al-Mammun* (Temir Khan Shura: al-Matba‘a al-Islamiyya li Muhammad Mirza Mawrayuf, 1913), 189–91, 199–201.

31. *Ibid.*, 189.

32. *Abusuf’ian Akaev: epokha, zhizn’, deiatel’nost’*: *Sbornik statei, perevodov i materialov*, ed. G. M.-R. Orazhev (Makhachkala, Dagestan, Russian Federation: Dagestanskoe knizhnoe izd-vo, 2012), 172

33. Kh. A. Omarov and G. M.-R. Orazhev, “Dokumenty i materialy o zhizni i tvorchestve A. Akaeva,” in *Literaturnoe i nauchnoe nasledie Abusuf’iyana Akaeva (Sbornik statei i materialov)*, ed. Orazhev (Makhachkala, Dagestan, Russian Federation: Institut istorii, iazyka i literatury im. G. Tsadasy, 1992), 108.

34. Mehran Mazinani, “On Liberty in Talebof’s Thought,” *Iranian Studies* 49, 3 (2015): 383–404.

35. For a still unsurpassed biography, see Hamid Algar, *Mirza Malkum Khan: A Biographical Study in Iranian Modernism* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1973).

36. Rebecca Ruth Gould, “The Critique of Religion as Political Critique: Mirzā Fath’ Ali Ākhūndzāda’s Pre-Islamic Xenology,” *Intellectual History Review* 26, 2 (2016): 172.

37. Such patterns are chronicled in Iraj Parsinejad, *A History of Literary Criticism in Iran (1866–1951): Literary Criticism in the Works of Enlightened Thinkers of Iran: Akhundzadeh, Kermani, Malkom, Talebof, Maraghe’i, Kasravi and Hedayat* (Bethesda, MD: Ibex, 2003).

38. Aryanpur, , *Az Saba ta Nima*, 1: 289.

39. Talibuf, *Masalik al-Muhsinin* (Cairo: Matba‘a-yi Hindiyya, 1323/1905), 4.

40. Talibuf, *Nukhba-i Sipihri* (Istanbul: n.p., 1310/1892), Talibov, *Istoriia Proroka Mukhameda* (Grozny, Chechen Republic, Russian Federation: Groznenskogo Tovarishhestva pechatnogo i izdatel’skogo dela, 1904).

41. Camille Flammarion, *Risala-yi Hayat-i Jadid* (Istanbul: n.p., 1312/1893–94).

42. Marku Awril [Marcus Aurelius], *Pand-nama-yi Markus, Qaysar-i Rum: Tafakkurat-i Marku Awril* (Istanbul: n.p., 1894).

43. Ahmad Kasrawi, *Tarikh-i Mashruta-yi Iran* (Tehran: Zawwar, 1340/1961), 43–46.

44. Talibov, “Predislovie,” *Istoriia Proroka Muxameda* (Grozny: n.p., , 1904), i.

45. Talibuf, *Masalik al-Muhsinin*, 4–8.

46. Gould, “Critique of Religion,” 172.

47. Talibuf, *Masa’il al-Hayat* (Tbilisi: n.p., 1906), 138–51. See also the discussion in Mana Kia, “Moral Refinement and Manhood in Persian,” in *Civilizing Emotions: Concepts in Nineteenth Century Asia and Europe*, ed. Margrit Pernau, Christian Bailey, Einar Wiggen, and Angelika C. Messner (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), 158.

48. Ḥusayn ‘Ali Tajir Shirazi, *Mikadu-nama* (Calcutta: Matba‘a-yi Ḥabl al-Matin, 1325/1907). See also Abbas Amanat’s chapter 12 in this volume on Adib Pishawari.

49. Bernd Martin, *Japan and Germany in the Modern World* (Oxford: Berghahn Books, 2005), 17–78.

50. Talibuf, *Masa’il al-Hayat*, 115.

51. Shiva Balaghi, "Constitutionalism and Islamic Law in Nineteenth-Century Iran: Mirza Malkum Khan and Qanun," *Human Rights with Modesty: The Problem of Universalism*, ed. András Sajó (New York: Springer, 2005), 327-348.
52. Talibuf, *Siyasat-i Talibi*, 7 and 5 respectively.
53. Deutschmann, "Cultures of Statehood," 188.
54. Stephanie Cronin, *The Army and Creation of the Pahlavi State in Iran, 1921-1926* (London: I. B. Tauris, 1997), 61.
55. Iago Gocheleishvili, "Georgian Sources on the Iranian Constitutional Revolution (1905-1911): Sergo Gamdlishvili's Memoirs of the Gilan Resistance," *Iranian Studies* 40, 1 (2007): 59 and 85.
56. Deutschmann, "Cultures of Statehood," 178.