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This study explores the inception of modernity in Iran by examining how the built environment was perceived and represented by Iranian travelers visiting Europe in the mid-19th century.

Recent scholarship on modernity in non-Western societies unsettles Euro-centric assumptions that depicted the global circulation of architecture as one way transit between the center and the periphery, the original and the copy. Taking part in questioning this unidirectional cultural dissemination, my project reverses the Orientalist gaze of Postcolonial theories. Here, I discuss how the Iranian traveler constructed *tajaddod* (Iranian experience of modernity) based on an “Occidentalist” imagery.

Many modern institutions and architectural typologies were first introduced to Iran by travelers who visited Europe. These individuals, following a long-standing Persian tradition of travel writing, often kept notes and diaries known as *safarnameh*. For the purposes of my research, *safarnameh* serve as non-participant recordings of how Iranians responded to the unfamiliar architectural landscape of the West.

To investigate how the message of European modernity was transformed by the travelers, I examine the differences between the descriptions of architecture in each *safarnameh* and the more prosaic perceptions of those spaces in the Western imagination. I look closely at the literary styles, figures of speech, settings, imagery, symbolism, exaggerations, narrative devices, and tones used by the Iranian writers in their interpretation of European architecture and urban facilities.

This study reveals how non-European imaginations, aspirations, fantasies, and agency were a vital part of the transnational dialectic of modernity. By projecting their own Persian/Islamic ideals and imagery onto their observations, these travelers developed a syncretic
understanding of modernity. Their encounter with a pre-imagined Western “Other” became the foundation of tajaddod.

When Iran’s experience of modernity is presented as a distorted copy of a Western phenomenon, Iranian architects are alienated from their heritage. They are presented with a false choice between (Persian) tradition and (Western) modernity. My project emphasizes that the Iranian desire towards a modern utopia is not radically alien to Persian/Islamic tradition. This approach advances humanities research by revisiting genealogical notions of a mythical original modernity by unraveling global entanglements.
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CHAPTER I:
INTRODUCTION

PROLOGUE

- “Let her give me one reason why in this situation we should leave for abroad.”
- “Show me a good reason why we should stay.”
- “I'll give you a thousand reasons.”
- “Tell me just one.”
- “My dad. I can't leave him. Do I need to give more?”
- [...]  
- “He's using this reason as an excuse right now: his father…”
- “I didn’t use it as an excuse.”
- “His father is suffering from Alzheimer's. He's not aware that he is his son. Or who's around him. What difference does it make to him? Whether it's you or someone else?”
- “Why do you say that? It matters.”
- “Does he understand that you're his son?”
- “But I know he is my father.”
- “Is your daughter not important to you? Her future is not important to you?”
- “Who said this is about our daughter? Why do you think it's only important to you? All these other children living in this country, do none of them have a future?”

The opening dialogue of Asghar Farhadi’s (2011) Oscar winning “A Separation” depicts a mental dilemma of the Iranian collective unconscious, stuck between a long history of its traditions and seeking a modern future. After 14 years of marriage, Simin, who finds her husband, Nader, resisting their initial plan to live abroad, files for divorce. The above dialogue happens in the courtroom while the camera is positioned on the judge’s seat. Putting on the judge’s hat, the audience is exposed to what Shayegan (1997) calls Iran’s schizophrenic mentality. Simin, who symbolizes the desire for progress, seeks better
opportunities for her daughter in the West, while Nader, feels an inner sense of duty to stay and take care of his father, who suffers from Alzheimer’s. Both Nader and Simin are ready to make a sacrifice, either by leaving their past or compromising their future. Assuming a Faustian posture, Simin suggests that to reach a progressive future cutting ties with all that holds one behind is necessary. For Nader, some values are not to be compromised. He sees the past, represented in the character of the father, as an extension of his present; thus any progress should acknowledge and value this history. Although the conflict between the generations helps comprehend the tension between the past and the future, it leaves us with many unanswered questions, some of which Simin should answer:

- Do all the roads to progress pass through the West?
- Do we not have any responsibility regarding our history?
- Are we morally allowed to simply leave our past behind?

The elderly father, who was once young and striving, can no longer control his bodily functions. He represents a historical attachment, either to the great Persian empire or to the golden age of Islamic civilization. Interestingly, as a constructed identity, this history suffers from Alzheimer’s and is unable to recognize the present conditions. As the film suggests, the inescapable tragedy is caused by the quixotic attempt of the father to purchase a newspaper, which signifies his failed attempt to connect to the present. Questions for Nader are:

- Except for urinating all over their lives, what is this father doing to the family?
- How real is this dream of a glorious past?
- Is this past morally allowed to hold the rest from progress?

While the director leaves these questions open, he makes it clear that “A Separation” is inevitable.

I have been seriously involved with similar questions since I started my studies in architecture at Yazd University. Advantageously located in the historic fabric of Yazd, the school of architecture exposed me
to an accretion of architectural experiences built up through centuries of local practice. This historic wisdom had generated an organic architecture, which through its complex and dynamic system, functioned harmoniously with the natural environment. Struck by an exterior phenomenon, however, the traditional architecture seemed to be in a coma over the course of the last century. Some critics label this phenomenon modernity and believe that Iran’s architectural heritage will not recover from the coma.

**DIALECTICS OF MODERNITY AND TRADITION**

When the me’mar (architect or mason) lays the first brick crookedly, the wall goes on crookedly up to the Pleiades.

This Persian proverb shows the mentality behind architectural practice in Iran, stuck between a long history of traditional experience and what modernity has to offer. Architects know that every abstract line they draw on a tracing paper and every rasterized shape they render on their screens will affect real lives. As an intellectual project, finding a balanced theoretical foundation on the unstable grounds between tradition and modernity is critical for architects and planners; failure to do so can otherwise cause disaster. An extreme example is the one that shocked the world most at the beginning of the millennium, 9/11. Mohamed Atta, one of the ringleaders of the September 11 attacks, studied architecture in Cairo University and the Technical University of Hamburg-Harburg. Concerned about modern development in the Middle East, Atta disapproved “haphazard attempts to modernize” and considered such attempts as a “shameless embrace of the West” (Thomas, 2001). The questions that I initially posed find more significance through this context:

- Is a tragic separation unavoidable?
- Is separation the only solution?
- Is modernity totally alien to Iran’s past?

This struggle to theorize the relationship between Iran’s traditional achievements and what it can gain from the experience of modernity in Europe has been an ongoing intellectual project and the subject of many
scholarly works in Iran since the 1850s (Boroujerdi, 2006, pp. 394, 395; Mirsepassi, 2000, p. 64).

THE FIRST BRICK

While recent scholarship on modernity in non-Western societies unsettles the previous Euro-centric assumptions that depict the global circulation of architecture as one way transit between the center and the periphery, the original and the copy (Amin, 1976; Anderson, 1983; Gilroy, 1993; Mehta, 1999; Mintz, 1985; Said, 1979; Spivak, 1988; Wallerstein, 1991), many Iranian critics of modernity still engage in equating modernization with Westernization. Assuming that modernity is by nature a product of occidental rationality (Hegel & Sibree, 1956; Marx, 1968; Montesquieu, 1973; Weber, 2002), they see it as a text written in the context of the socioeconomic changes in Europe and conclude that any attempt to rewrite such a text is at best an indifferent imitation or an “arbitrary and unsystematic copying from Europe” (Katouzian, 2004, p. 18).

These projects ironically dehistoricize and detemporalize modernity and conclude “the non-contemporaneity of the contemporaneous Iranian and European societies” (Koselleck, 1985; Tavakoli-Targhi, 2001, p. 4). By identifying Modernity with Europe, the West becomes a temporal destination for a society that has been on “holiday from history” (Shayegan, 1997). Equating Europe to the archetypal model of modernity emerges from a mentality that Sharabi (1988, p. 24) calls the “model-oriented consciousness.” Such an idealistic conception of modernity rejects other readings with terms such as distorted, deformed, inauthentic, and false (Sharabi, 1988; Shayegan, 1997). This logic explains the abundance of medical metaphors in the literature on modernity in Iran, where the so-called “distorted” Modernity is described in terms of a disease, e.g. “genesis amnesia,” “cultural schizophrenia” (Shayegan, 1997), “plagued by the west” (Al-e Ahmad, 1982), “melancholy,” “apoplexy,” and “paralysis” (cited in Tavakoli-Targhi, 2001). Such studies typically conclude with a diagnosis for the ill-formed Modernity in Iran. Boroujerdi’s (1996) “nativism” and
Mirsepassi’s (2000) “authenticity” are examples of such prescriptive attempts.

Departing from essentializing epistemologies and prescriptive tones, I have taken into account the subjectivity of modernity to reveal the complex mentality behind the Iranian understanding of the modern. If modernity in Iran has undergone a hegemonic transfer from the West, the cause of this so-called distortion, alteration, or deformation lies somewhere in the routes that modernity takes. Looking at the circulation of modern architecture in Iranian travel accounts of Europe in the 19th century, I argue that the route that modern architecture takes from Europe to Iran is a mental journey between the self and a preimagined Other. Otherness plays an important role in situating my research within the postcolonial literature. Applying a Foucauldian (2002) genealogical method to the study of Orientalism, Edward Said (1979) identified Orientalism as a self-defining project for the modern West. In his view, the West, as the center of a power relationship, constructs an imagined Other, colored by exotic fantasies, rendered with romantic memories, and filtered by colonial interests.

My study differs from Said in two ways. First, I deliberately ignore the effect that the exercise of power has on the orientalizing process. Although this choice might methodologically result in losing an important context, it opens new vistas to the study of East/West relationships. Fantasies, which have been ignored under the shadow of colonialism, find ways to foster and show their inspirations (see Figure 1). To make my point more clear, I will use another film example, James Cameron’s (2009) “Avatar.” In this movie, haunted landscapes, exotic beings, mystical objects, mythical ideas, sensual scenes, sublime imagery, erotic desires, and magical memories, which have been buried in the collective unconscious of the West, resurrect without being projected on the orient. In the void of a dominant power relationship, such stimulating fantasies and compelling dreams find life and prosper in the bodies of imaginary aliens in outer space.
Second, although I have kept Said’s explanation of how Othering creates a distorted imagery in my dissertation, I have changed the direction of the gaze. Here, I explain, it is the Iranian observer who constructs modernity based on “Occidentalist” fantasies. Literature on Occidentalism, or the image of the West by a non-Western observer, serves as the foundation for my study (al-Azm, 1981; Boroujerdi, 1996; Buruma & Margalit, 2004; Carrier, 1995; Chen, 1992, 1995; el-Enany, 2006; Ghanoonparvar, 1993; Hanafi, 1992; Nanquette, 2012; Tavakoli-Targhi, 2001; Woltering, 2009, 2011).

An example of the Occidentalist fantasies sublimated through imaginary Western subjects is depicted in miniature paintings of European Women. Figure 2 illustrating a European woman gently holding a young girl, on one level shows the culturally established aesthetics attributed to an idealized feminine beauty in Iran, through the doe-eyed subject’s large round countenance, large dark eyes, well-fringed with long lashes, over-arched by stretched thick brows nearly meeting above the nose,
small delicate lips, mole on the cheek, and long black hair. On another level, it projects an eroticized imagery of the Other through the subject’s seductively half closed eyes, tight fitting bodice emphasizing her exposed breasts, framed by delicate floral bouquets, as well as the child’s transparent shift, barely hiding her nudity (Diba & Ekhtiar, 1998, p. 208).

Figure 2. Mother and child attributed to Muhammad Hasan, second or third decade of the 19th century (Courtesy of Hashem Khosrovani)

THE INCEPTION OF MODERNITY IN IRAN

The general inquiry of my study has thus been focused on the Occidental mentality behind the Persian construction of “the modern.” To explore the genesis of modernity in Iran, I have framed my investigation
between 1813 and 1868, when the first Iranian encounters with industrial Europe take place. A certain moment in Iran’s history is considered by most scholars as the inception of the later modern turn: Iran’s defeat in a great war with Czarist Russia in 1813. This traumatic moment is very similar to the first awakening shock that the Ottoman Empire went through by losing the war against Russia in 1774 (Lewis, 2001). The war, in Foucauldian (2002) terminology, became a moment of rupture, break, and discontinuity in Iran’s history. The traumatic defeat was nevertheless “pregnant with its contrary” (1986), and therefore, initiated the mentality of introspection and the desire for transformation. This is what Berman (1988, p. 30) would call a shared experience of “perpetual disintegration and renewal,” i.e. modernity.

THE CIRCULATION OF ARCHITECTURE THROUGH SAFARNAMEH


Iran’s early awareness about the Other and its progress in the 19th century was mostly filtered through foreign advisors, who had missions to provide military and technical training, or through Iranian travelers who visited Europe. While the former group provided a precise but narrow perspective of modernity as it related to their field of expertise, the latter had the opportunity to see the modern world as a whole. Many travelers, following the tradition of travel writing in Iran, kept notes. These accounts, known in Persian literature as safarnamehs, are arguably the first modern literary form of writing and the predecessor of the novel in Iran. For this study, safarnamehs serve as non-participant recordings of what went through the mind of their author.

Safarnameh’s expedient recording of the experiences, emotions, and feelings creates a collage of snapshot information that depicts the subjective and fragmented observation of the travelers, especially when compared to other genres of writing, which tend to twist the initial
findings in favor of a coherent narration. The employment of phenomenological time to measure distance (Leask, 2002) makes the memoirs function as a kind of time travel fiction. Utopian futuristic writings, such as Edward Bellamy’s (1888) ‘Looking Backward’ and William Morris’s (1890) ‘News from Nowhere,’ had a great impact on social change in 19th century Europe. Unlike futurist utopias, Safarnameh maps a present and existing destination, which makes it a reliable path towards progress. This may be the reason why other scholars (Ghanoonparvar, 1993; Milani, 2004; Sohrabi, 2012; Tabatabai, 2006, 2008; Tavakoli-Targhi, 2001) have also used travel writings in their study of Iran’s history.

Although intended to be published, most 19th-century safarnamehs did not reach a broad audience in their time. Nevertheless, they were read by nobility who had more influence over the policy-making networks than the masses.

The tradition of writing Safarnameh in Iran had been a male discourse for centuries. The 19th-century Iranian travel writings, although different in style and approach, remain male dominated and elitist. Scarcity of travelogues by women as well as the elitist dimension of safarnameh is partially because of the high costs of travel to Europe and difficult modes of travel. Travelers who visited Europe in the 19th century, with a few exceptions, were young male elites who had the wealth and power to perform their travels. They are mostly connected with the ruling elite in Iran, (for example Mirza Hajibaba, who became the doctor of the royal court, Khosrow Mirza, who was a prince, Mirza Saleh, who became the official translator of the court, Rezagoli Mirza, who was a prince, Ajudanbashi, who was an ambassador, Aminoddowleh, who was the grand ambassador, Ilchi who was the foreign minister, and ultimately Naseraddin Shah,) and they usually possess higher literacy skills. For example, Mirza Saleh is a well-educated orientalist who has a great knowledge of Iran's history. Rezagoli Mirza and his brother, Vali, are also men of letters who are conversant with Persian literature and Islamic texts. This elitist background, gives them access to many architectural and urban spaces that would have been inaccessible to non-elites. On the other hand, many spaces that
accommodated lower classes and mundane functions remained hidden from them.

Some might argue that the information communicated through travelogues are unrepresentative, subjective, inaccurate, and deceiving and conclude its inappropriateness for research (Allport, 1942). Because this study is not concerned with an “objective reality,” if such a thing is accessible, the above characteristics are actually the potential of travel writings in understanding the “constructed reality” of modernity. However, some limitations complicate the usefulness of travelogues to historians. 1) Selective approach based on expectations; 2) reports of experiences and responses to those experiences that are intended to fashion a self that differs from the socio-economic, cultural, religious or educational realities of the writer; 3) a tendency to plagiarize from earlier sources, verbatim, and report them as one’s own experiences; 4) claims of having composed the accounts “on the spot” when in fact the writer did not visit the location under consideration.

THE RESEARCH ODYSSEY

I see myself as a traveler in the unknown world of old manuscripts and I wonder if I can manage to present the findings of this scholarly trip without projecting my expectations and prejudices on the material that I study. The hermeneutic circle convinces me that no understanding is possible without preconception; it, however, reminds me that I can apply methods to solidify my interpretation of the texts.

To see how the message of modernity was transformed by the travelers’ intentions, prejudices, ideals, limitations of the language, and expectations of the audience, I ask, what are the differences between the descriptions of space in each safarnamah and the actual space? What causes this difference? Is a pattern identifiable?

To address these questions, I study the differences between the descriptions of space in each safarnamah and the actual space in my dissertation. I look closely at the literary styles, figures of speech,
narrative devices, settings, themes, motifs, and tones to identify the imagery that the architectural and urban facilities, elements, details, structure, and ornament produce in the minds of the readers. In this process, architecture and urbanism determine the inclusion-exclusion criteria for the information taken into consideration for my study.

A HETEROTOPIC DISCOURSE

(1) MODERNITY AS A HETERO TOPIA

The travelers’ consciousness of modern space primarily involved a preconceived imaginative expectation about the modern world. This expectation, I suggest, is a utopian imagining of the West. In other words, Persian and Islamic ideals and norms play a major role in the process of constructing the early images of the modern West. By this theory, I do not intend to reduce the ambivalent feelings of the travelers to an uncritical glorification of European lifestyle. I am rather suggesting that a collective utopia governs how the travelers evaluate modern Europe.

The rereading of this collective utopia opens a heterotopic gate to the Iranians who had “arrive[d] at a sort of absolute break with their traditional time” (Foucault, 1986). Considering heterotopias, as “a kind of effectively enacted utopia in which the real sites, all the other real sites that can be found within the culture, are simultaneously represented, contested, and inverted” (Foucault, 1986), reformulates the dominant theories of modernity in Iran. I argue that “tajaddod,” or the Iranian experience of modernity, responded more to the culture that conceived it than to the originating culture. Emerging out of an intention to understand, control, manipulate and emulate what modernity has to offer, tajaddod transcends beyond a passive reflection of modernity.

(2) MODERNITY AS A DISCOURSE

The Iranian perception of modernity, as a phenomenon, deals principally not with its correspondence with modernity in the west, but with the
internal consistency of ideas about modernity. This constructed consistency and the constellation of ideas grow to shape a discourse of *tajaddod*. *Tajaddod*, as a systematically created body of theory and practice, which bears the intellectual investments of many generations, has evolved up to the present as pseudo-incarnations of the original thoughts.

*Tajaddod* has also produced counter-discourses which are again mostly related to the Iranian reading of modernity rather than modernity in the West. The Period of Awakening, according to Mirsepassi (2000), led to the formation of a new intellectual and political discourse among Iranian intelligentsia... There were also those who became involved in negating and rejecting the values of modernity... In either case, the encounter with modernity transformed the entire landscape of political and intellectual culture in Iran.

The theoretical foundations of negating and rejecting *tajaddod* in *mashru’a*, nationalism, *gharbzadegi* and eventually the Islamic Republic, although through different agencies, conceptualize such counter-discourses. *Mashru’a* was a quasi-constitutional system in which a council of Islamic jurists, as the sole legal authority, would check the adherence of public law to *sharia* (Amanat, 1992). Coined by Ahmad Fardid but publicized through Al-e Ahmad (1982), the term *gharbzadegi* (lit. “plagued by the West” or “westoxification”) refers to the loss of cultural identity through blind imitation of Western values.

The counter cultures in architecture are usually associated with romanticizing the purity of an imagined past, glorifying local traditions, and building upon a nostalgic view to either the Islamic or Persian architecture.

**WHY SO SERIOUS?**

Theories that introduce Iran’s experience of modernity, as a distorted copy of a phenomenon that is essentially Western, alienate architects and planners from the heritage that grew out of Iranian culture for
almost two centuries. This study emphasizes the Iranian desire towards a modern utopia and recalls the influence of the Persian ideals in the process of translating modern architecture and planning. Situating the origins of early modern architecture of Iran in-between Persian utopia and an imagined Other problematizes categorical oppositions between indigenous and foreign, as well as modern and traditional architecture in Iran. Formulating modernity as an intrinsic discourse which extends its root in Iranian traditions and ideals advances humanities research by:

- Contributing to a larger discourse about the global history of modern thought through a critical reexamination of the Eurocentric theories of modernity and exposing the mental route of architecture from Europe to Iran.

- Complicating our understanding of modernization in developing countries, by revealing the discursive nature of tajaddod in Iran.

- Providing new insights about contemporary debates in the region on Islamization, nationalism, and traditionalism, by articulating them as counter discourses to an occidental perception of modernity.

- Bridging the distance between multiple disciplines in humanities by applying methods and theories from disciplines such as architecture, urban planning, history, cognitive psychology, phenomenology, and hermeneutics.

**Research Layout**

I consider this work as a scholarly building and I hope my reader will enjoy the views I provide and benefit from residing in the text. This section serves as a map to facilitate the readers’ circulation in my dissertation.

While in Chapter One I have developed a theoretical foundation to this building, in Chapter Two I erect the structure which will bear the load
of data analysis that I conduct in Chapter Three. Therefore, an understanding of the central ideas such as Otherness, Orientalism, and Occidentalism are crucial for making sense of the chapters that follow.

As an entrance to Chapter Three, where the bulk of my discussions about the perception and representation of space in the travel diaries is allocated, Chapter Two introduces each travel account in relation to its author. Trying to associate the memoirs with the authors’ backgrounds, travel objective, and writing intentions, I have laid out Chapter Two around individual travelers. The cases that I examine are travel accounts written by Mirza Saleh Shirazi, Rezaqoli Mirza, and Aminoddowleh. I introduce each traveler and examine his writing in terms of style, narrative devices, and data collection methods.

In Chapter Three, the reader will be exposed to a different organization. Departing from a traveler-based analysis, in chapter three, I examine architecture and urban space through spatial elements such as form, function, materiality, ornament, and construction details. There I discuss how different urban and architectural elements were perceived by the travelers and whether a pattern can be identified in the descriptions of such elements.

Erected upon the previous chapters, my conclusion in Chapter Four is intended to provide alternative views and open new vistas to the reader. My ideas of modernity as a heterotopia and modernity as a discourse, which I have briefly introduced in chapter one, are developed as two windows that frame the problematic issue of modernity in Iran in a different way.

A NOTE ON THE TEXT

This dissertation employs Nasser Sharifi’s transliteration system laid out in his (1959) “Cataloging of Persian works”, the exceptions being: (1) for historical figures and places, I have kept the common spellings, (2) for quotes from English sources, I have used the authors’ preferred spelling, and (3) because different consonants are
pronounced alike in Persian, I have avoided diacritical marks, except for ayn and hamza.

Finally, all translations from Persian are mine unless otherwise indicated. As a Persian reader of the texts, 150 years after they have been written, I have tried to maintain the quality of the original language, in order to faithfully represent them in my translations. I am respectful that some of the discussed travel writers were not writing in their native tongue while others were more literary accomplished.


CHAPTER II: MODERNITY IN A SUITCASE

Few Iranian travel accounts are left from the first half of the 19th century. Travel writing was not an easy task at that time; the documents were threatened by the hazards of long journeys, and their authors were limited by the inconveniences of the road. Rezaqoli (1994, p. 691) recalls an incident in Istanbul when some of the Ottoman nobility requested to see his writing:

To avoid the dangers of plague, I asked one of my new servants... to heat the manuscripts with smoke... while I was talking [to my guests], I realized that the stupid fellow was burning sections of the only copies of the books that I have been writing with such hardship and for such a long time... Since it was already over, there was no sense to punish the foolish servant. I rewrote whatever I could recollect, a small portion [of what I had lost].

Rezaqoli’s companion, Assaad Kayat, who translated the book into English, also lost parts of the material during his trip:

The translator of these pages exceedingly regrets that the latter part of the history, consisting of about twenty pages... was robbed on his journey... He considers himself very fortunate that the Bedouins only took these few sheets from the book for curiosity [thinking that it was the Quran]; for when they examined his saddle-bags on the camel, and found that it contained books and letters, and other papers, they asked him why he was so great a fool as to carry, along with him such a load of useless papers and books, which could neither be eaten nor drunk (Rezaqoli, 1839, p. 123).

Travelers who intended to record their journeys were thus confronted by many difficulties, which did not cease upon return to their homeland. Some travelogues were never published, and continue to be kept privately as unique manuscripts.
The travelers whose writings I study in this dissertation are Mirza Saleh Shirazi, Rezaqoli Mirza, and Aminoddowleh. These individuals come from a wide variety of backgrounds. Their dissimilar missions, wealth, and class status plays out in the differing durations and itineraries of their trips. The diversity of their level of education, literary skills, sources of information, as well as how they chose to report their observations, affected the image that they tried to convey to their intended audiences. For example, Mirza Saleh, who came from a relatively modest economic background, devoted much of his writings to the impoverished classes and the social service they received. He describes orphanages, charity schools, work houses, madhouses, children’s hospitals, and the health treatments available to the poor (Shirazi, 1985, pp. 180, 181, 274-276, 338, 352). Aminoddowleh and Rezaqoli (1994, pp. 317, 318), in contrast, were members of the Iranian aristocracy and thus showed more interest in military facilities.

In this chapter I discuss such differences by introducing each travel memoir, its significance, its author, and the way the authors narrate their voyage. The chapter is laid out around each traveler to emphasize his individual background and the way it affects their writing.

MIRZA SALEH

BIOGRAPHY

In their attempt to modernize the country, the Crown Prince of Persia, Abbas-Mirza (1789 – 1833), and the grand vizier, Mirza-Bozorg Qa’emmaqam, sent two groups of students to England to become familiar with modern technology. The first group was sent in 1811 and the second in 1815. Among the second group was Mirza Saleh Shirazi (see Figure 3 and Figure 4), who studied history, natural philosophy, English, French, and Latin in England. Upon his return to Iran, Mirza Saleh was appointed as the state’s official translator and later became the Vizier of Tehran (Adamiyat, 1961).
Figure 3. This sculpture commonly believed to be of Mirza Saleh, is part of the Albert Memorial in Kensington Gardens, located at the north side of the Royal Albert Hall. The monument includes four groups of sculptures representing Europe, Asia, Africa, and the Americas. Yahya Zaka believes that the sculptor of the monument’s Asia group used Mirza Saleh as the model of the Persian character in the monument (Shirazi, 1985, p. 35). This is a doubtful assumption. First of all, the sculpture was designed by John Henry Foley (1818–1874), not Robert William Sievier (1794–1865) as Zaka suggests. Second, Foley was 12 years old when Mirza Saleh visited England. Third, the monument was commissioned by Queen Victoria in memory of Prince Albert. The prince died in 1861; the memorial was commissioned in May 1868 and opened in July 1872, which is four decades after Mirza Saleh had left England.

Mirza Saleh who was “well known for his literary acquirements” (Price & Mirza Saleh, 1823, p. vi) assisted William Price and Sir Gore Ouseley in their research on Iran. He also authored a set of dialogues in Persian which were translated to English by Price in his “A grammar of Three Principle Oriental Languages” (Tavakoli-Targhi, 2001, p. 32).
Mirza Saleh is best known as the first newspaper publisher in Iran. He established one of the first printing presses in Tabriz in 1819 and by 1837 he moved one or two of these presses to Tehran, where he published the first and only issue of his newspaper entitled .permission: Tali'a-ye Kaghaz-e akhbar (newspaper). In the same year, he founded the first newspaper to be issued regularly, called Akhbar-e vaqaiyyeh (news and events) (Floor, 1990).

**ITINERARY**

Figure 5 shows Mirza Saleh’s route to his various destinations:
Figure 5. A map showing the path and modes of travel Mirza Saleh had taken to reach his destination. The blue lines show sea routes and the green are land trips.

A more detailed itinerary including the places that Miraza Saleh visited can be found in the appendix A, at page 177.

NARRATIVE ORGANIZATION

Wherever I arrive, I start by introducing the place and its history and then I write my ruzaneh [diary] (Shirazi, 1985, p. 186).

Mirza Saleh’s writing has a more clear organization compared to other writers that I discuss. One reason for the clear organization is the author’s careful attention to the style, structure, and content of his writing which is evident on the occasions in which he seeks advice about his memoirs from his peers: “I asked Colonel Khan how I should approach my daily writing. ‘Whenever some major incident occurs,’ he replied, ‘for example when the ship’s mast breaks, when thunder strikes, or when water floods into the ship.’” (Shirazi, 1985, p. 147)
The content of Mirza Saleh’s notes is comprised of two very different types of materials, which accordingly require different narrative devices. Mirza Saleh (1985, p. 108) shows that the two-part structure of his writing is intentional by stating, “first I write about the condition and events of the city and then I proceed to my personal ruzaneh.”

The first section is what Mirza Saleh (1985, p. 155) calls ruzaneh, where he records his daily memoirs. For this section, which centers around what Mirza Saleh has personally experienced during his trip, he uses a first person voice to communicate his feelings, observations, encounters, discussions, and the difficulties that he experiences. Mirza Saleh (1985, p. 104) explains, “During the day, I traverse the city and investigate the urban affairs and the people’s traditions and behaviors as much as I can, then I record whatever possible in this ruzaneh.”

Aware of the genre and precedents, Mirza Saleh (1985, p. 177) lays out his ruzaneh in the typical safarnameh format, or in his own words, “the way travelers do it.”

The second part of Mirza Saleh’s (1985, p. 108) writing is the sections dedicated to educate the reader about the issues that he finds important:

I find it more advantageous to write as much as I can on introducing the city, its origins, and people’s customs and traditions so that the people who read it can benefit from it.

Providing detailed accounts of topics such as Napoleon’s invasion of Moscow, history and geography of Russia, Napoleon’s biography, political history of Britain, and economic institutions of England, Mirza Saleh (1985, p. 108) never loses track of his main goal to discuss “the process of progress in this land, not history of kings.”

Mirza Saleh (1985, p. 193), who is aware that these detailed accounts requires a particular attention to details and their accuracy and may take a long portion of his writings, is apologetic to his readers about the length of his writing.
During the three or four months [that I am staying in London], it would be a good idea to write about England, its condition, the regions, and how they are structured, as I did in Russia. Nonetheless, writing about this region requires detailed articulation; otherwise it would be difficult to understand... Therefore, I need to write in detail about the affairs of this era. I hope the readers will forgive me for the length of my writing.

These informative sections, which are scattered in the book, might have been initially intended to be published as separate books. The current structure of the book however includes them in the chronological sequence that they were written and integrated with Mirza Saleh’s daily diary. Because these parts, which are mostly translations of the sources that Mirza Saleh (1985, pp. 78, 85) was reading, were intend to be detached from the author’s experience, they adopt a third person tone. Natural to the content but unlike the literary style of his time, Mirza Saleh’s writing is very simple in style. He is the only writer among the ones that I have studied who does not use poetry in his writing, as was the convention at the time.

OBJECTIVITY

Mirza Saleh’s attention to objectivity distinguishes his writings from other travelogues discussed in this study and the typical writing style of his time. He is a close observer who seeks the most appropriate sources for his reports. For instance in reporting on the wool industry in Exeter, Mirza Saleh (1985, p. 181) contends, “I asked from one of the accountants how much wool is traded in the city. He informed me that each week between 80 and 100 thousand Tomans worth of wool is traded.”

However, his sources go beyond eye witnesses and word of mouth; Mirza Saleh (1985, p. 141) constantly refers to multiple sources and books for his questions, and he makes sure to cite the most authentic sources. For example on writing about trade economy in London, Mirza Saleh (1985, p. 266) cites the customs’ annual reports. In many instances, after reporting the common explanations that people provide
in response to his inquiries, Mirza Saleh (1985, p. 16) cross examines
the data from multiple sources, expresses his doubts, makes his
reasoning process clear, and suggests alternative explanations:

Regarding the population of Moscow, it is 500,000 as the Russians
as well as some of the Iranians here report by word of mouth. But
according to a French history book and two English [books]..., which were written with precision and research, the population
that resides in the city is 250,000 and the population in the
surrounding villages is 50,000 (Shirazi, 1985, p. 78).

What distinguishes Mirza Saleh’s work from the other sources in this
study is his insistence on citing other authors (Shirazi, 1985, pp. 1, 58, 68, 85, 141, 194, 399, 419) and his companions (Shirazi, 1985, pp.
114, 115, 181, 396, 403). For example, when writing on Istanbul’s
houses, Mirza Saleh (1985, p. 402) notes,

[O]nce the regular people, or any other person, are asked about
the number of public baths, they would reply that 200,000 or
300,000 baths, 15,000 mosques, and 2,000,000 houses exist in
Istanbul. Nevertheless, Efendi, which means the sheriff of
Istanbul, has reported the number of houses to the authorities. I
got a copy of this report from an English doctor. There are
88,185 houses in Istanbul.

Like a cautious scientist and an observant writer, Mirza Saleh tries
hard to avoid absolute phrases to keep his report safe from any
falsehood. Many of Mirza Saleh’s (1985, pp. 23, 25, 26) sentences start
with adverbs such as “seemingly,” “reportedly,” and “probably,” to
qualify his report. Mirza Saleh's penchant for precision regarding the
information that he gathers restricts him from reporting information
that he cannot validate. It is as if he does not trust any source
unless he can personally verify its accuracy. Even when, “the English
Mr. William as well as Mirza Abolhasan Khan [Ilchi] and most people say
that this city [Saint Petersburg] is the best of Farangestan cities,”
Mirza Saleh (1985, p. 115) who does not assume to know all cities of
Farangestan, shows his reluctance to confirm such a statement by
replying “so far, I have not witnessed a better city as well.”
Mirza Saleh’s distrustful attitude towards the information that he cannot verify intensifies when the news is sensitive or important. Reacting to the most important news of his time, Mirza Saleh (1985, p. 101) explains, “these days, I have heard that Napoleon has lost the war, but since it hasn’t been confirmed yet, I shall not take it seriously.”

Mirza Saleh leaves many of his descriptions incomplete because he refuses to report on issues that he is not able to verify. With excuses such as “I did not have enough time to investigate the issue accurately”, “I did not see the rest of the rooms on the third floor” or “I was not allowed to visit inside the building,” Mirza Saleh (1985, pp. 74, 112, 187) expresses his regret that “he cannot write more about the subject.”

While other travelers discussed in this study, who were substantially less informed than Mirza Saleh, concealed their weakness in communicating with others, Mirza Saleh, who knew several languages, was not ashamed to acknowledge his linguistic limitation. For example, in explaining the plot of a play that he saw in Moscow, Mirza Saleh (1985, p. 102. or see 372 for another example) leaves his narration incomplete by admitting “I did not understand the rest of their conversation.”

The most important indicator of Mirza Saleh’s attempt to remain objective and situate his observations within their specific context is his use of measurement systems. Unlike other travelers who try to keep their Iranian measurement system as much as they can (Rezaqoli, 1994, pp. 336, 341), either because they are more used to it or because they feel their readers will better understand it, Mirza Saleh constantly converts the measurement units. And on every occasion that he changes the units of for example, weight, length, and currency, Mirza Saleh (1985, p. 114) makes sure to communicate the new system to the reader. When leaving Tbilisi, Mirza Saleh (1985, p. 63) reminds his readers that “from now on, it is necessary to know that the Russian unit of length is called verst, and every 7 verst is equal to one farsakh.” This approach shows that Mirza Saleh is inclined to analyze the
findings of his trip not based on a predetermined mindset but rather from a framework that every situation suggests.

Didacticism

Because I have stayed in London quite a while, I think it is best to write about London, its history, places, buildings, schools, and other characteristics, as well as its government and commerce, so the reader who has not seen the city can get informed (1985, p. 260).

Mirza Saleh’s intention to educate his readers makes him more conscious about the presence of an audience for his writing. His mentions of the possible readers of the manuscript are more than that of other writers and the way he approaches the audience is different. In contrast to most other travelers of his time, Mirza Saleh, trying to remain detached from what he reports, seems to be less interested in impressing his audience with amusing stories about the peculiarities of Europe. In addition to the content of his writing, Mirza Saleh’s writing style also adopts a cold scientific tone that leaves less room for fictionality.

His writing seems totally devoid of any normative position; it is as if nothing can amuse his positivist mood, not a castle in Isfahan that people believe to be a property of one of King Solomon’s demons (Shirazi, 1985, p. 16), nor the acrobats and tightrope walkers in Vauxhall gardens (see Figure 6).
While other travelers would not miss the opportunity to eroticize and excite the readers, Mirza Saleh’s (1985, pp. 337, 284) descriptions of swimming pools that are not gender segregated, and artists in the Royal Academy of London who are painting a nude model, are limited to a short sentence.

**SIGNIFICANCE**

Unlike other travelers, who did not get published until recently, Mirza Saleh managed to publish a version of his travelogue in the 1820s and an English translation of excerpts of it in 1824 (Tavakoli-Targhi, 2001, p. 44). The influence of his historical accounts as well as his simple and clear writing style on his contemporary readers is unquestionable. Even Today, Mirza Saleh’s memoir is referred to as the “first history of England in Persian” and “the first step towards modern history” in Iran (Tabatabai, 1380, pp. 268-269).

Mirza Saleh’s memoir is especially significant for this study in that he has also written about his travels in Iran. Through a comparative
study of Mirza Saleh’s writings about his trip to Europe and his trips inside Iran, I shed light on his preconceptions about Farangestan.

REZAQOLI MIRZA

BIOGRAPHY

Upon his succession to the throne in 1834, Mohammad Shah (1808-1848) discharged and imprisoned his uncle, Hoseyn-Ali Farmanfarma, who, as the governor of the important province of Fars, was a chief rival to the throne. Fearing for their lives, Farmanfarma’s descendants fled to Baghdad. Farmanfarma’s oldest son, Rezaqoli Mirza, who led the family, sought British support to free his father and claim back their land and properties. With this intention, Rezaqoli and his two brothers, Vali and Teymur Mirza (see Figure 7), left for England in 1836.

Figure 7. Rezaqoli Mirza on left, Teymur Mirza in the middle, and Vali on the right. Drawing by John Partridge, July 1836.
During this trip, which lasted almost 14 months, Rezaqoli took detailed notes, which were later translated to English by Asaad Kayat (1839) (see Figure 8) and published in 1839.

![Asaad Kayat](image)

Figure 8. Asaad Kayat, the princes’ companion during their journey and the transaltor of Rezaqoli’s travel account to English

Kayat (1847, p. 110), who accompanied the princes during their trip, found them “remarkably quick of comprehension.” the eldest brother, Rezaqoli, who was the governor of Bushehr, had a charismatic and inspiring character. According to Kayat (1839, p. x), he was “a man of superior talent and wisdom, who was the vicegerent of his father.” Rezaqoli knew Turkish and some Arabic and was quite informed in Persian
literature and history. Fraser (1973, p. 20), who had also accompanied the princes during their stay in London and on their way back to Istanbul, describes Rezaqoli as “a man of very amiable dispositions, gentlemanly feelings and manners; a great deal of innate dignity of character...”. He (1973, pp. 128, 129) compliments Rezaqoli on his “charm of sweetness and of dignity... which secured him affection as well as respect from those of any feeling around him.” Fraser (1973, pp. 128, 129), who in his other remarks shows that he is not reluctant to openly criticize people’s characters, praises Rezaqoli by admitting that he had never “known a Persian of any rank possessed of so many amiable qualities.”

Teymur Mirza, the youngest brother, was known “for his bravery and strength” (Kayat, 1847, p. 110). Kayat (1839, p. x) describes him as a “celebrated warrior, horseman, and hunter.” He was fond of drawing and enjoyed playing the santur, an Iranian hammered dulcimer. Fraser (1973, p. 94) was impressed by Teymur’s vivacity, gallantry, and his careless happy disposition: “He is blessed with a fine temper, and a high and buoyant spirit, which, though sometimes breaking out into momentary blaze of passion, renders him a cheerful animated companion” (Fraser, 1973, p. 24).

Vali, the stepbrother of Rezaqoli and Teymur, was the most learned among the three. Although less sociable, he was well-informed in literature, geography, religion, and history of Iran. Kayat (1839, p. x) knew Vali as “a well known Persian and Arabic scholar, an excellent poet” and enjoyed discussing religious subjects with him. Fraser (1973, p. 21) praised Vali as “shrewd and intelligent, well versed in the learning and accomplishments of his own country, a keen observer, an acute reasoned, with a decidedly intriguing and diplomatic turn, and a general force of character.”

ITINERARY

Figure 9 shows the princes' route to their various destinations:
Figure 9. A map showing the path and modes of travel that Rezaqoli and his brothers took to reach their destination. The red lines show land trips and the blue are sea routes.

A more detailed itinerary including the places that Rezaqoli visited can be found in the Appendix B, at page 194.

NARRATION

Rezaqoli’s travel account has a hybrid content, a mixture of personal daily activities and didactic information, which in many instances lacks a clear demarcation between the two. Interestingly, in the first chapters of his travel account that is devoted to Iran’s contemporary history, Rezaqoli applies a passive tone, as if to conceal his presence as the author and make his claims more authentic. After 60 pages, when
the discussion turns to his own travels, the author appears through a first person narration.

Except for few instances (p. 305), Rezaqoli does not communicate the sources for his information. From the writing of Fraser, we understand that his translator, Kayat, was in charge of gathering the information that Rezaqoli sought. Occasionally, Rezaqoli uses his limited knowledge of English to collect data for his writing; this becomes more evident when the conclusions he makes are not accurate. For example, when he talks about newspapers, he explains that the word has two parts, “new” and “paper,” which together “refer to a paper that has the most recent information” (Rezaqoli, 1994, p. 559).

As Fraser (1973, p. 130) suggests, Rezaqoli spent his forenoons to writing his journal. While in many cases, it is clear that Rezaqoli writes on spot and with short intervals (p. 193), other sections especially in the texts added to the book’s margins, traditionally called hashieh nevisi, were written later and sometimes with a different handwriting (p. 173), most often Vali’s. In parts of his writing, Rezaqoli has left blank spaces, hoping that he would fill them later with more accurate information. For example, when discussing an art gallery in London, Rezaqoli (1994, p. 390) left a space to later insert the name of the artist, which he never did.

WRITING STYLE

Obsessed with the elegance of his writing, Rezaqoli applies an overelaborate style which stands out when compared to other travelogues of his time, particularly Mirza Saleh’s direct and unadorned prose. In many instances, Rezaqoli’s sentences are ornate with occasional rhymes or semi-rhymes. His abundant use of metaphors, poetry, and Arabic verses, lend more to exhibit his mastery over literary devices, rather than conveying meaning. The embellishments of his writing, although overshadow the substance, serve well in endorsing his elitist background. On several occasions, Rezaqoli (1994, pp. 151, 406, 435) reminds the readers of his accomplishments in poetry through stories of his literary discussion with others. He presents himself as a poet,
well acquainted with Iran’s history and literature, by discussing the Persian collection in the library of East India Company (p. 472) and by commenting on Mirza Ebrahim Shirazi’s translation of a history book (p. 485).

Rezaqoli adorns his writing with verses from the Quran and more than 100 couplets of poetry from 15 poets, ranging from Sa’di, Hafez, and Ferdowsi to less famous poets such as Naziri-Neyshaburi, Kamaloddin Esma’îl, and Asheq-Esfahani. He occasionally uses his own poems, as well as Vali’s. Rezaqoli’s adoption of poetry usually happens when he writes about European women. In occasions that he uses poetry to describe space Rezaqoli aims to romanticize natural landscapes rather than the built environment. Impressed by a landscape outside Beirut, Rezaqoli appropriates the following words from Hafez (2006, p. 136):

Myriad besotted eyes caress my sight in the city:
I’m tippled with no need to drink any wine.
Lavished full with flirtatious nymphs from six directions;
Poverty prevents me, though I’m a costumer of all six directions!

The poetic tone of Rezaqoli’s safarnameh alludes to a possibly unintentional glorification of Europe. This romantic longing for heavenly space/landscape/women/wine is re-inscribed directly from the ideals fashioned in Persian poetry and Islamic texts.

FICTIONALTY

Rezaqoli, although as Fraser (1973, p. 244) says, “[has] at all times evinced a greater desire to see the useful objects of interest in the country, than those merely calculated to afford amusement,” writes about the “amusing” objects of Farangestan no less than the “useful” ones. His travelogue is filled with stories, from heroic wars to funny anecdotes. Rezaqoli masterfully adopts storytelling techniques to entertain his readers. His character developments goes to such details to include their Persian accents in the text (p. 155). He even entertained Princess Victoria of England with his stories as much as she and her mother “almost fainted of laughter” (p. 444).
Nevertheless, obsession with entertainment becomes central to Rezaqoli’s writing. On the one hand, this attitude makes him too conscious of his readers and thus he conceals the facts that may relegate the elitist status of the author. For example, in his writing, Rezaqoli pretends that he does not consume alcohol (p. 206) while we learn from Fraser that the brothers were quite fond of drinking. On the other hand, this fascination with fictionality has resulted in an exaggerated report of events, in which the brothers are located at the center. Even when Rezaqoli is reporting on events that his brothers have experienced, his writing style does not change, as if he himself has witnessed the event. For example Rezaqoli reports Teymur’s visit to Cádiz with a passive tone so that the reader could not identify the subject (p. 336). A similar approach is taken when Rezaqoli discusses Vali’s first trip to London (pp. 352-371).

In Rezaqoli’s stories, he and his brothers are usually at the center of the narration. Examples of such stories include fighting under extreme cannon fire (p. 87), being surrounded by 30 of the enemy’s horsemen and escaping the blockade (p. 90), freezing almost to death under severe snow (p. 94 & 261), fighting bandits (p. 191), being robbed (p. 146 & 661), being attacked by a giant hog (p. 189), extreme thirst and drinking from sewage water in which two dead jackals were decomposing (p. 189), dueling with an Arab thief (p. 191), shooting an asp (p. 194), getting lost in the desert (p. 211 & 208), getting stuck in a swamp (p. 252), getting hit by a storm while sailing toward England (p. 288). I have to admit that although extremely suspicious about the validity of such anecdotes, I did not find any evidence that would falsify Rezaqoli’s claims.

As the brothers travel towards Europe, the stories become less about themselves and more about the wonders that they witnessed.

SIGNIFICANCE

Rezaqoli’s safarnameh has been an important source for studying the history of Iran. The book includes a significant explanation of the contemporary political conflicts within Iran starting from the death of
Fath-Ali Shah in 1834 to the assassination of Qa’em-ma’qam in 1835. His detailed explanations of modern institutions in Europe as well as his meeting with high ranking official of Britain, including, yet to become, Queen Victoria, add to its significance.

For this study, Rezaqoli’s memoir has been of great value. Together with the diaries of Kayat (1847) and Fraser (1973), who accompanied the princes in their voyage, the travelogue reveals parallel worlds that allow for a comparative study between Rezaqoli’s spatial experiences and his perceptions.

AMINODDOWLEH

BIOGRAPHY

Aminoddowleh, Abu-Taleb Farrokh Khan Ghaffari (1812-1871), was a high ranking official in the Qajar court. In his political career, Aminoddowleh had served as the Governor of Gilan in 1839, Governor of Kashan, Naseraddin Shah’s Grand Ambassador in 1857, Minister in Attendance in 1858, Minister of the Interior in 1859, member of the royal council in 1859, member of the council of the state 1866, and Minister of Court in 1866.
As Ilchi-e kabir (the grand ambassador), Aminoddowleh was sent to the court of Napoleon III in 1855 to resolve political conflicts with Britain and prepare a peace treaty with the British (see Figure 10). This treaty, known as the Treaty of Paris, ended the war by an Iranian retreat from Herat. During this mission, which took over two years, Aminoddowleh charged his secretary, Hoseyn Sarabi, to prepare a diary of the travels. This travel memoir is a significant document for historians, mostly because of the importance of the political mission, the high ranking status of Aminoddowleh and the people he visits, such as Napoleon III, King Leopold I, and Queen Victoria. Seldom has the context of this narration been discussed for cultural and social studies.

ITINERARY

Figure 11 shows Aminoddowleh's route to his various destinations:
Figure 11. A map showing the path and modes of travel Aminoddowleh took to reach his destination. The red lines show railroads, the blue are sea routes, the green are land trips, and the dashed black lines represent unknown travel modes.

A more detailed itinerary including the places that Aminoddowleh visited can be found in the Appendix C, at page 200.

FORMAT

Although Aminoddowleh never mentions any precedents, he is conscious about the centuries-long tradition of travel writing in Iran and his memoir clearly fits in the travel writing genre. Besides the political documents included in the book, what makes Aminoddowleh’s memoir surpass a typical travel writing format is embedded in his intention to publish his notes as a book. In a letter addressed to Aminoddowleh, his secretary, Hoseyn Sarabi requests funding for publishing the memoir in Tabriz, Iran. From this document, we can conclude that the manuscript was intended for a wide audience.
Since the primary audience of the book was the nobility and the king himself, Aminoddowleh had to avoid many topics and follow certain codes; this for example can be seen in occasional and out of place praises of the king, Naseraddin Shah. Aminoddowleh’s memoir, compared to other travelogues of his time, makes almost no mention of the elements that are considered improper in his contemporary culture. For example, contrary to other travel writings of his time, in Aminoddowleh’s memoir there is no talk about prostitution, no attempt to eroticize women and their relationship either to the author or to other men, and almost no mention of alcohol, except when a toast was made in the honor of the king. For a close observer and detailed reporter as Aminoddowleh, this silence cannot be accidental. The explanation to Aminoddowleh’s intentional concealment of issues that fascinated most other travelers, who tried to respond to the fantasies and expectation of the intended audience, is his intention to bypass the censorship in publishing the book. His effort was nevertheless in vain.

The reason that the book was not published at the time confirms its significance. When Mirza Agha Khan Nuri, the Grand Vizier of Naseraddin Shah, learns that Aminoddowleh is determined to publish his memoir, he writes a letter and warns Aminoddowleh against doing so:

I have heard that Mirza Hoseyn Sarabi, the secretary of the Grand Ambassador, has written a book, under your supervision, about the details of your trip to Europe; and he intends to publish it in Tabriz. I should remind you that during his mission, Saif el-Mulk also decided to publish a similar book with the objective to educate people on the differences between the state of affairs in Iran and Europe, with which I disagreed. Certainly, you would not allow Mirza Hoseyn to publish this book and distribute it all over. This will cause public awareness about Europe which is not appropriate (I. Afshar, 1994, p. 62).

This statement confirms the potential importance of such documents to educate the public and also shows how resistant the officials were towards the development of any “public awareness” about Iran’s backwardness.
NARRATION

The narration of the travel account cannot be simply considered as Aminoddowleh’s first person voice. The travelogue is actually written by Aminoddowleh’s secretary, Hoseyn Sarabi (see Figure 12). Sarabi is acting as a sort of ghost writer, who is recording the memoirs of Aminoddowleh's travel, yet refers to him in third person. Interestingly, in a part of the trip where Aminoddowleh tours Italy and Prussia, Sarabi is not accompanying him; nevertheless, his descriptions of the events, which Sarabi must have heard from Aminoddowleh, do not differ much from the rest of the book. This could be for several reasons:

1) The details described are assumed by Sarabi to be impartial and devoid of personal judgment. Therefore, he considers Aminoddowleh’s reports of his trip as authentic as his first hand observation.

2) Keeping the journal up to date required Aminoddowleh to take notes of the events in Italy and Prussia to be included in the report.

3) The narrative focus is on Aminoddowleh, his discussions, and his interests; therefore, even in the parts of the trip that Sarabi has personally experienced, he tries to conceal his personal view.

4) His pattern of writing about the places that Sarabi has not visited follows the same pattern that he adheres to in general. The author assumes familiarity with the Other that he tries to describe; thus personal observation does not add much information.
The typical format of Aminoddowleh’s narration is to introduce the city, discuss general information about its population, climate, agriculture, and industry, describe the events, mention the people he visits, and discuss the “peculiarities” that he observes. The information in the book in part resulted from direct observation and data gathering. Some of the information, such as the population of a city, the budget spent on a project, or the history of a building, clearly come from secondary sources, which the author never cites. There is also no mention of guidebooks, maps, catalogues, or brochures.

The writing style is not very significant in terms of rhetorical eloquence, dialogues, or stage setting. Although his language is plain, Aminoddowleh’s descriptions are vivid. Most of the book follows a day-by-day account; yet, there is no evidence suggesting that the writing follows the same daily pattern.

Architectural discussions are secondary but still comprise a significant part of the narrative. However, descriptions of
architecture get less detailed as the journey proceeds. Despite the fact that almost all events are less elaborated in the final parts of the book, this pattern is stronger for architecture because the author finds the spaces less "peculiar" as he gradually becomes more familiar with the architecture of the Other.

SIGNIFICANCE

Aminoddowleh's travel memoir was not published until 1982. Some might thus argue that the document has little significance for the study of the early discourses on modern architecture in Iran. Others may also claim that the central goal of the text is to report on the political mission, and that the architectural information is secondary.

To claim that the memoir is written for the purpose of reporting on the diplomatic negotiations and concluding that the socio-cultural issues are secondary is not accurate. Actually, part of Aminoddowleh’s mission was to report on the state of progress in the countries he visited. Naseraddin Shah himself, who later made three journeys to Europe, was very eager to learn about Farangestan and personally asked most of his ambassadors to deliver a report “about the reasons behind the wealth, progress, and success of the nation of Farangestan” (1994, p. 267).

Not only was Aminoddowleh investigating the progress in Farangestan, he was also assigned to bring back modern technologies to Iran. When visiting an iron foundry in Liège, Belgium, Aminoddowleh (1994, p. 311) emphasizes this important part of his mission by declaring, “in this mission, I have been granted full responsibility to send as many technicians and factory equipment as possible to Iran.”

Aminoddowleh’s memoir, similar to the other ones studied here, did not reach a wide audience at its time, however it caught the attention of the elite who had the biggest share in the power structure. The oral culture was dominant in Iran at the time, thus the memoirs could function as a written report of the otherwise oral circulation of ideas about Farangestan. Interestingly, the few times that Aminoddowleh (1994, pp. 215, 216, 285) (similar to Rezaqoli (1994, p. 488)) addresses his audience, he does not use the word “readers” of the book,
but rather calls his audience same’in or mostame’in, which means the “listeners.”

During his administration, Aminoddowleh supervised many architectural and urban projects, mostly after returning from his journey. All these structures directly or indirectly reflect how Aminoddowleh’s observations influenced his architectural practice.

MODERNITY AS A SOUVENIR

The three travelers studied in this chapter, although different in their level of education, socioeconomic class, and personality, share two significant qualities. The first is that they all joined the Masonic lodge. Except Aminoddowleh (1994) who joined the Grand Orient of France Lodge in Paris, the other travelers joined the Freemasonry lodge in London. It seems that all three travelers had some prior knowledge about the fraternity which raised their curiosity about its mysterious nature. Most travelers talked about how they joined the lodge, but with some secrecy. Mirza Saleh (1985, p. 176) says that,

it had been a while since I desired to join the Freemasons, but I never had the time... With Mr. Percy and Colonel D. Arcy we entered the Masonic lodge, had dinner, and returned around 11 pm. Writing more on this topic is not permissible.

Similarly, we learn from Kayat’s translation of Rezaqoli’s (1839, p. 287) travel account that “Wali [Vali] joined the Freemason Society, having beforehand written a request to the head of the Society for his reception, and to-day (Thursday) they hold their monthly meeting, and Wali took his first degree.” These few lines translated by Kayat do not exist in the Persian edition of the books published under the title of Rezaqoli’s travel account. When talking about his own membership in the Lodge of Friendship of Freemasons, Rezaqoli (1994, p. 444) freely talks about his desire to join this “noble, honorable, and desirable society.” He talks about the membership requirements, the meaning of freemasonry, the degrees, yet, similar to Mirza Saleh, reminds the readers that “[t]his is all [he] can say about freemasonry” (1839, p. 124).
When in his diary, Fraser, talks about the excitement of the brothers “on the day appointed for their initiation,” he gives a rather convincing explanation of why he finds most Persians so interested in freemasonry:

There are few of our European institutions which allure more the curiosity of Orientals than freemasonry. Its mysterious secrecy excites their imagination, and particularly of those,—a very large portion, especially in Persia,—who are disposed to Soofeesm [Sufism] or freethinking in religious matters. The accounts they have received of the freemasons of Europe, magnified and probably distorted by the channels through which they reach them, dispose them to imagine that to belong to this fraternity is to obtain possession of much mystical and supernatural knowledge which is hid from the uninitiated (Fraser, 1973, pp. 231, 232).

The second attitude that the travelers had in common was that they appreciated the materializations of modernity in Europe and were resolute in their intention to bring them home. Adoption of modern technology, even at the first encounters of Iran with Europe in the industrial age, is not submissive. When explaining the concept of the clock, as an instrument to indicate and co-ordinate time, Rezagoli (1985, p. 568) cautiously suggests,

The Farangi (Western) system is seemingly better than the Orientals’ who calculate time based on sunrise and sunset, because day and night change during different seasons, while midnight and midday remain fixed. Now that they have invented this technology, it is best to adopt it.

Apart from their writing, which they regard as an instruction manual for those seeking the progress of Farangestan, the travelers each bring back a souvenir. “I thought to myself,” writes Mirza Saleh (1985, p. 344), once he learns that the government has required his return,

other than my education, it would be nice if I could bring something back from this country that could benefit our
government. It had been a while since it crossed my mind to take a printing device with me.

Mirza Saleh (1985, pp. 345, 418) goes through a great deal of hardship, purchasing the equipment, getting trained, and passing through customs in order to bring back printing machinery. As I discussed earlier in p. 19, Mirza Saleh initiated a print press and published the first newspaper in Iran.

Aminoddowleh, who upon return was appointed as the Minister in Attendance, had more power to implement the Farangi technology that he fancied most, the telegraph. In his travel to Europe, Aminoddowleh also recruited a French photographer, Francis Carlhian, who worked in Tehran for a few years. While recent scholarship suggest that he arrived later than Aminoddowleh, in December 1860 (Salmasi, 2004, p. 222), others believe that Carlhian accompanied him when he returned to Iran. Carlhian, as Etemadossaltanah (1985) reports, “came with Aminoddoleh from Paris to Tehran, to propagate the science and methods of photography. He popularized the collodion photography in Iran.”

“The princes,” Fraser (1973, p. 250) says, had expressed “a wish to see rather some of our more useful institutions than trivial exhibitions and amusements, which leave little impression, and lead to no improvement.” The elder prince, he (1973, p. 244) continues, “appeared constantly on the watch for useful information, as if he still entertained the hope that one day or other he might again be in position to turn it into account.” Fraser was right, from the beginning of his trip, Rezaqoli had in mind to bring back a special object:

We visited a manufactory for the purpose of purchasing some instruments, and a pump, which is capable of drawing water from the depth of seventy draas. This latter I bought for 200 tomans, to be used on our return to the Holy Land (Rezaqoli, 1839, p. 88).

In reporting such cases, I am not trying to focus on the object that the travelers brought back, but I rather seek to demonstrate this curios attitude that the travelers shared. They studied whatever they
witnessed in Farangestan as if to break to codes of modernity and reassemble in Iran through an indigenous reverse engineering. This idea is partially evident in Fraser’s diary when he observes the prince’s curiosity in the “institution” of a hospital for old men and women: “[he] seemed to think that, if ever he were in power again, it would be one of the things he should wish to imitate” (Fraser, 1973, p. 12).

All in all, what I am suggesting here is that, 1) through Freemasonry, the travelers sought a shortcut to access the “mystical and supernatural” roots of Farangi progress. And 2) their adoption of the technological manifestations of modernity is indicative of the travelers’ desire to implement Farangi accomplishments in Iran. Of course, the Farangi accomplishments that the travelers could implement were a small fraction of those they fancied. The rest was recorded in the safarnamehs for future implementation, either by the travelers or their readers. Therefore, safarnamehs’ significance should not be reduced to a journal of personal affairs; it should rather be seen as a practical list of To-Dos for progress, a user guide to modernity, and a road map to the future.
CHAPTER III: WHEN WORLDS COLLIDE

Oh, East is East and West is West, and never the twain shall meet
Till Earth and Sky stand presently at God’s great Judgment Seat;
But there is neither East nor West, Border, nor Breed, nor Birth,
When two strong men stand face to face, tho’ they come from the ends of the earth! (Kipling, 1889)

VERBALIZING SPACE

The lack of an established vocabulary to describe space was reflected in the travelers’ poor word choices, usually limited to the size, materiality, and cleanliness of the buildings they experienced. This inability to describe the quality of a space was due in part to the void of critical attention to space in Persian literature. Persian writings focusing on architectural space are few in number prior to the 20th century. The underdevelopment of an established lexicon to describe the quality of a space urged the travelers to fall back on a quantitative approach. Constant measurement of spaces, although limited to the size and number of architectural elements, shows the attempt to understand the spaces despite the inadequacies of language.

Usually, as the travelers reach the end of their trip, their spatial descriptions show a shift towards a more diverse set of analytical tools. For example, Mirza Saleh (1985) abandons his frequently used black-and-white categorization of cities as kharab and abad, ruined or thriving. Similarly, Rezaqoli (1994, pp. 216, 239), who only uses the word ba-safa (delightful) to describe space early in his travelogue, begins to adopt a more diverse vocabulary. Another example that show the progression of architectural descriptions in the travel writings is Aminoddowleh’s (1994) gradual discussion of functionality in space as well as his application of uncommon adjectives such as “sweet” and “lively” to describe cities and streets. These cases show how the
travelers gradually learn to equip their narrative devices with a wider architectural vocabulary.

The authors’ weak expression of spatial qualities was coupled with the lack of similar experiences by the audience. In other words, not only were the travelers challenged in their search for pertinent signifiers, but they also knew that their signified objects and spaces were alien to their audience. Mirza Saleh (1985, p. 102) shows his awareness that a shared experience is a prerequisite to a successful communication when he states, “although one will not understand what I write or say unless one sees it, I will try my best to explain.” Similarly, Rezaqoli (1994, p. 488) when trying to discuss a flea circus, is concerned whether the reader (or in his own words, the listener) is capable of visualizing the peculiar phenomenon that he is about to explain:

mentions of these events, will cause nothing but disbelief in the mostame’in (listeners). They may assume my dishonesty, when I talk about a small insect performing in such a manner, but I am not concerned with their trust, for I am writing this for my own gratification.

In response to this paucity of architectural lexis, the authors approach the description of space in a number of ways. Some give up the idea of describing events which had not been experienced by the reader with excuses such as “[it] could not be conceived by human mind, but it must be seen in person” (Rezaqoli, 1839, p. 494). Others, try different media to express their observations, for example Rezaqoli (1994) mentions that his brother “Teymur made a sketch [of a Rhinoceros in the London zoo] so he would not forget its image.” Unfortunately these sketches, which according to Fraser (1973, p. 132) were done with great taste and enthusiasm and by spending a lot of time, are not available today.

Another strategy involves the (de)construction of words to demonstrate their reference to novel concepts. For example, Mirza Saleh’s (1985) development of the word “rahahan” [literally means iron-path] for railroads, Rezaqoli Mirza’s (1994, p. 393) “negar khaneh” [literally means drawing-house] for art exhibitions, and Aminoddowleh’s (1994, p.
“ruznameh” [at the time, it meant diary] for newspapers. Although the constructed words might not have been etymologically unprecedented, they associated with ideas that were different from what they previously referred to. Interestingly, all the aforementioned examples found their way into Persian vocabulary and are used even today to refer to what these travelers communicated in the 19th century. The construction/redefinition of such concepts and their inclusion in the culture not only show the significance of the travel culture in building an Iranian experience of modernity but also suggest its discursive nature.

Another strategy entailed referring to the common experiences of the audience that were close to the subject of their description. For instance Rezaqoli’s (1839, p. 285) memoir describes a peculiar animal on his visit to a zoo:

The most wonderful animals of all, were a pair of creatures larger than an elephant, and higher than a camel, their necks are fourteen feet long, and their legs are handsome, their tails are like that of an Arab horse of red color, and with white spots on the face.

Because the reader would not have witnessed the signified creature, Rezaqoli uses familiar images, such as camel, horse and elephant, to explain his observation. As a reader of Rezaqoli, the image that this explanation generated in my mind was very different from what I later discovered in the diary of Fraser. Fraser, the British official who accompanied Rezaqoli and his brothers during their stay in London, states, “they were all struck with admiration at the “giraffes,” a creature which they had neither seen nor heard of before” [emphasis added] (Fraser, 1973, p. 121).

The same communication strategies are evident when the travelers attempt to describe Architectural space and elements that are totally unfamiliar to their audience. When Aminoddowleh, for example, tries to give the audience an idea about the sitting area in Champ de Mars, he compares it with the tekyeh, an often open space that serve as a venue for ashura religious mourning rituals (Calmard, 2004). The vocabulary
that is used to describe the buildings is derived from an existing terminology of architecture that for centuries was used to signify specific domestic spaces. An example is Aminoddowleh’s (Aminoddowleh, 1994, p. 158) description of a building that “is elevated from the ground with marble. Upon it a soffeh exists and all around, circulates a gholamgardesh, which consists of 70 or 80 marble columns.”

Figure 13. A 3D construction of the image that Aminoddowleh’s description of a Greek temple would produce in his audience’s mind

Referring to well established concepts of space in Persian architecture, the image that Aminoddowleh’s description generates (see Figure 13) is far from what he has observed (see Figure 14), which happens to be a Greek temple in Acropolis.
In another instance, Aminoddowleh (1994, p. 167) says “we passed through there and in the middle the talar a me’jar of cast iron traversed around a square soffeh.” Aminoddowleh’s audiences, who have not seen the space, would have a rather indigenous imagination of the spaces that he describes with words such as soffeh, me’jar, talar, and gholamgardesh (for the definition of these concepts see the glossary on page 209). It is like describing a Buddhist temple to a mediaeval audience with concepts such as transept and nave.

Although this deformation of meaning is part of the limitations of language, I would like to argue that the effects may be even more alienating for architectural terminology. For example, words such as gholamgardesh or talar have many conventionally accepted layers of
meaning, which may even include their module, orientation, and construction technique. The complex layering of meaning in premodern architecture is mainly because maps, such as plans, sections, and elevations, were seldom used to construct a building at the time. Communication of ideas between the client, the master builder, and other parties involved in the construction process occurred through architectural vocabulary. In order to function as a pattern, in the sense that Christopher Alexander (1977) suggests, architectural vocabulary had a more precise and complex connotation.

**QUANTIFYING SPACE**

In short, if a man does not see it, he could not believe any description of it. The outside of this church all round, and the inside consists of four quarters; each of them is two hundred feet long, and fifty feet broad; the church is three hundred feet high (Rezaqoli, 1839, p. 269).

The travelers were determined to report the signs of progress that they encountered in Europe accurately. To overcome the absence of a vocabulary for describing the qualities of space to an audience who “could not believe any description of it,” they attempted to enrich their records via quantitative data and measurement. The quantitative assessment includes length, height, weight, and age of space and objects, as well as cost and duration of construction; in the case of Mirza Saleh, who adopts a scientific approach more complex measurement tools such as geographic coordinates (Shirazi, 1985, p. 109) and construction speed are also applied. While Aminoddowleh prefers less scientific means such as step counts, Mirza Saleh, in most cases, provides standard measurements. In Moscow Kremlin, Mirza Saleh (1985, p. 79) says the Tsar Bell (see Figure 15) is:

Currently on the ground... It is the largest bell in the world. Its height is 6 zar’ [almost a meter] and 0.5 shahi, its periphery is 21 zar’, and its thickness is three quarters of a zar’. Their book claims that the bell weighs 72 thousand man-e Tabriz.
Unlike Mirza Saleh, most of the spatial measurements that Aminoddowleh provides in his memoir, such as the number of columns, arcades, lamps, steps, wall widths, and space areas, are not information collected from secondary resources but surveys performed by the crew. When visiting a ship along the banks of the River Thames, Hoseyn Sarabi (1994, p. 329) explains,

> When we climbed over the ship, Aminolmolk [Aminoddowleh] asked Mirza Reza the translator to survey the ships length and width. It was 314 steps long and 36 steps wide and its height was 30 meters, almost like a 6 story castle.

Rezaqoli has a mixed approach. When the measurements that he provides have non-Iranian units, he has most likely collected the data from secondary sources; otherwise, he is reporting his own calculations or measurements. “For the sake of amusing ourselves,” Rezaqoli (1839, p. 259) says, “we sat at the window to gaze at those who passed by. We observed multitudes of people, and so many were carriages which passed, that according to our calculation, they were 3000.”
Interestingly, all travelers, Mirza Saleh (1985, pp. 6, 18, 36, 188, 272, 283, 352), Rezaqoli (1994, pp. 152, 336, 369, 406, 411, 450, 462, 486, 488, ), and Aminoddowleh on many occasions provide financial estimates. At the beginning of their writings, these estimates are mostly concerned with the “profits” that institutions such as hotels, exhibitions, and theaters make; and as the writing develops more mentions of project “costs” are seen. Mirza Saleh’s scientific approach as well as Rezaqoli and Aminoddowleh’s administrative backgrounds can be traced in their financial inquiries and reports:

Another church is St. Paul’s Cathedral [see Figure 16]. It seems that its length from inside is 183 zar’, its width is 84 zar’, its height is 112 zar’, and its periphery is 800 zar’. The whole cathedral is built of white stone. It has cost 750 thousand Toman. If they decide to build a similar building today it would cost 5 times more, because today a laborer’s daily wage is a quarter Toman but before, they paid 10 workers a quarter Toman (Shirazi, 1985, p. 272).

Figure 16. An early 19th-century view of St. Paul’s Cathedral by Thomas Hosmer Shepherd
The travelers’ attitude in providing financial estimates of material manifestations of progress in Farangestan confirms their intention to bring back more than a theory of progress. The question of finance shows their interest in the applicability of the ideas in Iran.

In short, the travelers’ quantitative approach, especially for nonarchitect readers, may seem sufficient not just for a general scheme but even for reconstruction. What tends to be lost in this quantitative translation of space is the overall image. Paradoxically, this approach conveys a feeling of precision while it is unable to produce the formal imagery it intends to. While the reader projects his own preconceptions on what the author seeks to describe, the measurements solidify the imagery with false quantitative authority.

FROM MOTHERLAND TO OTHERLAND

Concepts of Farang and Farangi in Persian, similar to their literal derivatives, such as farâŋ in Thai, ferenggi in Malay, barang in Cambodian, and alafranga in Turkish, etymologically refer to France and French (Ghanoonparvar, 1993, p. 2). While today Farang and Farangi signify the less ambiguous concepts of the West and Westerners, since the late 18th and early 19th centuries, these terms have represented an all-encompassing image of the Other, which disregarded Farang’s cultural, historical, and social differences. During this period, and unlike their early applications in the 13th century literature, in which the terms connoted an “inferior” and hostile image of the Other, Farang (also used as Farangestan) referred to an “advanced” Other.

Transcending from a merely analytical tool, Farangestan, as a social construction, was a politicized objectification of geographic and cultural space in a binary system where the benchmark is located in the self.

To better understand Farangestan, I would like to introduce another concept, shahr-e Farang (see Figure 17). Shahr-e Farang, which literally means “City of Farang,” was a replica of the eighteenth century peep show or la vue d’optique or as Arabs would say “Sundiq al-dunya”. Basically a stereoscope, which shows images that appear three
dimensional to the viewer, shahr-e Farang was slightly re-designed for the viewing port to sit in front of the box instead of on the top. It also allowed multiple viewers to see the show simultaneously. Ghaffary (1984, p. 364), who happens to be Aminoddowleh’s grandson, explains that shahr-e Farang had three viewing ports with thick lenses that projected stereoscopic images. Consisting of a large brass-bound box, shahr-e Farang was a wonderbox that showed images of Farangestan cities that included a variety of heterogeneous locations, ranging from Mecca to Saint Petersburg. Much like shahr-e Farang, which included a multitude of different concepts within a box, Farangestan constructed a collage-like imagery that refused to signify a particular geographic territory.
In the studied diaries, the word Farangestan has been used frequently. Farangestan, as a preconceived image in dialectic opposition to the Iranian self, affected the travelers’ perception of places and objects they encounter in their voyage. Their voyage was no longer a journey to unknown geographic regions, but rather a “transition from the imaginary to the real” (Findley, 1998, p. 22). The travelers arrived in Farangestan only to rediscover the originals of the stories that had for long been the subject of their fantasies. Rezaqoli (1994, p. 419), for example, when first sees a balloon, recalls that “I had heard about this technology in Iran and I was eager to see it.” Prior to his trip, Rezaqoli (1994, pp. 228-231) spent several hours, and dedicated several pages, to “instructions about Farangestan,” as he had learned from the British Consul in Damascus.

Before his trip begins, Rezaqoli considers Farangestan somewhat of a specific geographic region, with clear borders, one king, a singular history, a unique shari’a (religious law), specific customs, art, and outfit (Rezaqoli, 1994, pp. 185, 282, 300, 524, 309, 223, 387, 384). When the British Consul in Beirut asks where he intends to go, Rezaqoli’s (1994, p. 268) response is Farangestan. During his foray and as Rezaqoli becomes familiar with the notion of Europe and its many countries, this simplistic image of Farangestan, which sometimes specifically refers to England, gets more complicated. He recognizes Farangestan’s various countries, languages, laws, and climates (Rezaqoli, 1994, pp. 630, 592, 649, 657).

The case of Istanbul in Aminoddowleh’s memoir shows the flexible signification, the deterritorializing essence, and the dialectical adjustment of Farangestan to incorporate new observations. On his way to Europe, when Aminoddowleh (1994, p. 52) first arrives in Istanbul, he assumes it as part of the unitary mental map of Farangestan:

> From Iran’s embassy to Sultan’s Palace [Dolmabahçe, see Figure 18], which is called the building of Beşiktaş, is about an hour. All the streets were well maintained and on both sides were Farangi stores and houses.
Upon his return to Iran, since Aminoddowleh had visited many European countries, the Ottomans were downgraded in his mental hierarchy of progression and automatically fell outside the ever-changing borders of Farangestan. In this stage of his memoirs, Aminoddowleh constantly points out the backwardness of the Ottomans, this time in contrast to a new understanding of Farangestan. Aminoddowleh’s (1994, p. 416) critical attitude, which is quite rare in the entire memoir, gets to its extreme in the Dardanelles that he describes as:

an extremely filthy city; the streets were all rocky and full of dirt... these signs that I observed show that the Ottoman nation is facing decay every day. This decadence is because of nothing except ignorance. It will not take long till they will be totally finished.

When his trip is almost over, Aminoddowleh considers himself a person who has a thorough knowledge of Farangestan. This we know from how he narrates his conversations with Abdülmecid, the Sultan of the Ottoman Empire from 1839 to 1861, as well as his Prime minister. Serving as a medium to convey his self-opinion, both people as portrayed in Aminoddowleh’s story, consider him an expert of Farangestan. Through the voice of these characters, Aminoddowleh (1994, pp. 424, 426)
addresses himself as a person “who has visited all of Farangestan” or “knows all about Farangestan.”

But what is even more surprising is that even on the very first day of his arrival in Europe, Aminoddowleh seems to believe that 1) there is one unitary theme behind all buildings of the Farangestan; and 2) he already knows this theme. With such an elaborate imagination of Farangestan’s technology, culture, customs, laws, shari’a, and lifestyle in the minds of the travelers, it is legitimate to expect a “Farangi style of building” (Rezagoli, 1994, p. 215). “Athens,” Aminoddowleh (1994, p. 160) suggests on his first stop in Europe, is designed on the layout of the cities in Farangestan, its streets are straight and paved with stone... Outside the city on a vast field, the king has built a palace based on the Farangestan design. On one side, there is a special garden and on the front a spacious square.

Farangestan, here, finds its meaning not from outside referents, but as an alternative to the self. It reduces all different styles of architecture and urbanism to a unitary category. The differences in the architectural styles of the mid-19th century seem irrelevant to the travelers. They easily attribute any building that matches their notion of an ideal building, whether revivals of historic styles or industrially influenced structures, to Farangestan, which at this stage, for the travelers symbolizes progress. This essentializing dichotomy of Iran vis-à-vis Farangestan can also be seen when Aminoddowleh (1994, p. 171) describes the ancient ruins of Pompeii, Naples where,

the layout of the buildings is like in Iran. First, the houses are one story and each house has a courtyard and a reflecting pool in the middle. Second, the paintings in the rooms are similar to the ones in Iran. Each building has a separate andaruni (private section of a traditional Iranian house) and biruni (the public part of the interior); not at all does it resemble the Farangestan design.
The Farangestan style is not only attributed to architecture and urbanism, but also to furniture and ornamentation. When, Aminoddowleh’s secretary is narrating his own story about his visit to Russia a year travelling to Europe, he talks about a lady who invited the embassy to her house:

It was a house in the middle of a huge garden, built in the style of Farangestan houses and gardens. And, whatever you may find in the houses of the Farangi nobility was available in her house (Aminoddowleh, 1994, p. 179).

These descriptions show that the author, as well as the intended reader, already has an idea of what may be found in the houses of Farangi nobility. They confirm the idea that to the travelers, Farangi architecture serves as the alternative to the existing condition of Iran’s architecture, which they understand as buildings that are single story, follow a central courtyard pattern, have a reflecting pool in the middle, and are based on a strict division between public and private spaces.

This constant mental journey between the existing self and the preconceived ideal Other, that the author is experiencing, is important when this ideal Other is regarded as the future self. To understand this preconceived utopian Other in the authors’ minds, a quotation from Aminoddowleh when he describes Naples is enlightening. He (Aminoddowleh, 1994, p. 169) rates Naples as “the best among Farangestan cities” Because of,

its good weather, quality of its location, and the beauty of the city. Besides the sea, the city lies with a length of 3 miles and its width reaches the hill. Perfect buildings, on top of one another, reach the peak of the hill. All houses have a courtyard and in the middle of winter all kinds of flowers are glowing and all trees are green and fresh, hanging from them are fresh oranges, lemons, and tangerines... A big city, a fine port, and perfect buildings, four to five stories, with wide and straight streets paved with stone, neat and clean.
The first question that comes to mind is, since Naples is one of the first cities in Europe that the author is visiting in his trip, how can he already know that it is “the best among Farangestan cities?” One unlikely explanation is to assume that Aminoddowleh has written or edited the memoir sometime after the tour is over or during the last days of his trip. Another option is to think that he had already a general understanding of Farangestan, before visiting it. We know that this trip is Aminoddowleh’s first visit to Europe. His secretary, who is the actual author of the memoir, has however visited Russia a year before this trip. So this description might be an attempt to compare Naples with what he has seen before of Farangestan. Both options confirm the essentializing connotation of Farangestan that goes beyond the geographic boundaries of Europe and also suggest a subconscious image of Farangestan that to Aminoddowleh is even more authentic than its objective reality.

Aminoddowleh’s (1994, p. 162) description of Messina, interestingly, opens with the same phrases that he uses to describe Naples. He mentions four to five story building, straight paved and clean streets, houses with courtyards, and orange, lemon, and tangerine trees.

Mirza Saleh, who unlike Aminoddowleh has a more scholarly approach, is very attentive to mention the actual names of every little town that he visits. This attention, however, does not prevent him from using the nonspecific concept of Farangestan. Although early in his writings, Mirza Saleh adopts the concept loosely, unlike other travelers who constantly readjust their understanding of Farangestan, Mirza Saleh gradually abandons the concept in favor of Europe.

Describing a room in the Kremlin, Mirza Saleh (1985, p. 78) says that “the ceiling was arched, not flat” (see Figure 19). The way this phrase is mentioned in the text suggests that prior to seeing Moscow, Mirza Saleh expected to see more flat roofs, which are typically ascribed to the Farangi style. Like Aminoddowleh, who on his way back from Europe, excludes the Ottomans from his understanding of Farangestan, Mirza Saleh alters his perception of Russia, but in a much earlier stage of his voyage. “Because the Russian government,” Mirza Saleh (1985, p. 83)
states, “attracts business from all of Farangestan’s countries, they have appropriately made progress.” Apparently, Russia, “although appropriately progressed,” does not fit in his image of Farangestan. Mirza Saleh (Shirazi, 1985, pp. 62, 65) clearly considers the style of buildings in Tbilisi and Mozdok to be “Russian;” and when in many other instances such as in Nakhchivan he notices buildings with a “Farangi” style, he perceives them as exceptions (Shirazi, 1985, p. 49).

Figure 19. A drawing of Cathedral Square in the Moscow Kremlin by Fyodor Alekseyev (1753–1824)

Even when he visits Saint Petersburg, which he refers to as the best city he has seen through his trip, Mirza Saleh (1985, p. 108) is still hesitant to include it as part of Farangestan: “What intrigued Peter the Great to build this city was the fact that no other city in Russia had access to the Baltic Sea in order to provide maritime trade with Farangestan.” On at least ten other occasions, Mirza Saleh (1985, pp.
113, 119, 128) makes it clear that he does not include Saint Petersburg as a city of Farangestan, nevertheless there are instances that show his ambivalent position about the city. “Because Peter the Great,” Mirza Saleh suggests:

had seen other Farangestan cities, he designed the whole city in one stage, based on his taste, Farangestan’s architects, and what he had observed. Mr. William of England, Abolhasan Mirza, and most other people say that Saint Petersburg is the best of Farangestan cities (Shirazi, 1985, p. 115).

As Mirza Saleh’s journey progresses, his image of Farangestan better fits within the boundaries of Europe. For example, Mirza Saleh (1985, p. 123) describes Russia as, “one of the biggest countries in the world and actually the strongest among all other countries in Farang. Some of its regions are part of Farangestan; they call it European.”

Interestingly, Mirza Saleh’s mentions of Farangestan stop once he leaves Saint Petersburg towards England. It seems that by then Mirza Saleh (1985, pp. 405, 408) had replaced the concept with the more specific idea of “Europe.”

Studying how the dynamic borders of Farangestan transform in the travelers’ minds and consequently in their writings accentuates the role of seas in constructing the image of Farangestan. Beirut, Saint Petersburg, and Istanbul, respectively in Rezaqoli, Mirza Saleh, and Aminoddowleh’s preconceptions, had the elements of progress that they expected from Farangestan. Sailing away from these cities, the travelers modified their image of Farangestan, only to exclude what was previously part of their understanding of Farangestan.

Bodies of water serve as mental borders that foster exchange of ideas and cultural concepts. They not only define geographic regions but also constitute mental territories. In other words, sea becomes a medium between the realm of the self and the unfamiliar overseas. While land travelers see the changes gradually as they approach their destination, maritime transport allows for a sudden experience of surprise and astonishment.
At the city gate [of Damascus], we saw something like a gigantic elephant riding a horse. Well, not much was visible from the bulk of the poor horse except for his two ears. When it came closer, we realized that it was a human being with such a physique. Subhanallah! His huge belly had covered the horse’s neck and his hips were over its thigh. I asked the British Consul, [John William Farren], with astonishment, ‘have you ever seen such a person before?’ ‘I have journeyed all of the seven Farangestan,’ he replied, ‘where all kinds of man exists, but never have I set eyes upon a person with such a figure.’ (Rezaqoli, 1994, p. 224).

One who writes about a journey sees it as a deviation from the routine. In travel writing, often the author abandons descriptions of the regular in favor of the unexpected. Many of the studied travelers who write in their journals daily, keep the entry empty by saying “nothing interesting happened” (Rezaqoli, 1994, p. 217). This attitude suggests that the travelers saw no point in reporting on events that lack an unfamiliar nature. Naturally, most travelers of this period tried to entertain their reader with the peculiarities of Europe. The Europe that they represent is a wonderland: a fairy-tale world full of unusual objects, weird gadgets, and strange habits. Their travel writing thus serves as a collection of personal anecdotes about their exclusive access to this wonderland. The art of storytelling unconsciously drives them to exaggerate the differences and accentuate the oddities. No wonder Ilchi (1986) calls his diary Heyratnameh, the Book of Wonders.

The image of Farangestan is knit with oddities and peculiarities. In all Farangestan, as Rezaqoli (1994, p. 305) assumes, “they don’t have yogurt, nor do they have a bathroom.” When making this comment, the only European country that Rezaqoli has visited is Malta, which he considers “a village compared to Farangestan cities” (Rezaqoli, 1994, p. 305).

Rezaqoli’s memoir is filled with stories of Farangestan’s oddities, for example a creature with a long tongue that ate ants (p. 273), a tortoise larger than a cow (p. 284), a person who sold corpses and
mummies to tourists (p. 285), a gigantic ship (Caladonia, see Figure 20) that resembled a floating city (p. 301), shipwrecked sailors who had to eat two of their mates to survive (p. 328), a strange animal brought from South Africa (p. 391), a mental patient in London’s madhouse who had been screaming day and night for 17 years (p. 458), a balloon crash, a dog that embarrasses its owner in a party by exposing his dirty underwear (p. 499), dogs shopping for their owners with baskets that contain money (p. 537), and a dog as big as a cow (p. 642).

Such stories allude to a mysterious and exotic rendering of Farangestan as a place of fantasy, rather than a true depiction of what raised the travelers’ curiosity. For example, Fraser observes that the eldest prince, on his way back from a tour of St. Paul’s Cathedral, showed quite a bit of excitement by seeing wax busts in a hair-dresser’s window: “I do think he was more tickled by these same wax dolls than by all he saw at St. Paul’s” (Fraser, 1973, p. 76). This claim may be true in a sense that the Cathedral satisfied the prince’s expectation of
Farangestan’s splendor, whereas the wax bust created a sudden sense of surprise. But quite understandably, the travelogue, taking part in building upon the constructed image of Farangestan, never mentions a wax bust. It however dedicates a full description of St. Paul’s Cathedral, which could better lend to the expectations of Farangestan. In a similar case, when the Princes complained to Fraser about their dull visit to a zoo, Rezaqoli’s diary pictures the event as a joyful tour and dedicates several pages to a detailed description of its wonders. It is fair to say that the mystery of Farangestan did not originate from what the travelers’ “subjectively” found wondrous, but by deviation from what they “culturally” understood as normal.

This attitude also confirms that the travelers actively took part in the process of enriching the magical qualities that were associated with Farangestan. They seldom tried to demystify Farangestan, but rather spiced their experiences with a slight taste of wonder and curiosity. For example, when Rezaqoli (1994, p. 387) first experiences ascending by an elevator, he represents it as a wondrous room with seats which flew as a bird in the sky for 15 minutes until it landed on a different floor. On the contrary, Fraser, who had accompanied them during this tour, informs us that the brothers were in fact not quite as amazed as they allude to in their description: “They preferred ascending by steam in the cylinder, to mounting the staircase on foot. The movement astonished them a good deal; but it was not altogether a grateful sense of wonder” (Fraser, 1973, p. 118). Similarly, in the same building, when Rezaqoli describes the moment when he and his brothers first set eyes on a panorama, he mystifies the experience by pretending that they were unable to “distinguish between the real and artificial:”

After I had a full view of the country, I said to Mr. Fraser that, although this is a very excellent view of London and of the country, yet I should like more to see and visit some of the English arts, and asked him to take us to such places, because what we see here we see every day. Mr. Fraser laughed at our question, and said, ‘Is any art better than what you are actually now seeing?’ What an art is it! we said; does any one doubt the
power of the Creator, by whose order this world was created with its natural beauty? Then Mr. Fraser said, ‘This heaven that you see is not more than four yards distant from you; if you throw an orange against it, it will return back to you...’ I was angry with him at his saying this, it seemed as if he were playing with us. I said, ‘O man, have we not eyes to distinguish between the real and artificial?’ Mr. Fraser replied, ‘It would be impossible for you to know how this is done, unless you saw it.’... This increased our disbelief; however, we went up and down until we were satisfied (Rezaqoli, 1839).

Again, Fraser’s diary sheds light on this story. Although the brothers “examined every part of the picture,” as Fraser (1973, p. 119) says, “[t]hey appeared quite to understand that it was a painting upon a sheet.” They even commented on the painting’s details and noticed the cracks in the plaster. This attempt to make their observation sound magical is not exclusive to Rezaqoli but emerges in all travel accounts that I have studied.

As part of the re-mystification of Farangestan, the travelers were eager to report on places and objects that hold some kind of record. The abundance of superlative adjectives, even in Mirza Saleh’s memoir, confirms this tendency to search for and write about materials that bear some kind of wonderment. England’s tallest church spire at Salisbury Cathedral (1985, p. 178) (see Figure 21), England’s largest organ at Exeter Cathedral (1985, p. 180), England’s biggest naval hospital at Plymouth (Devonport) (1985, p. 187), and the world’s largest dockyard at Bristol (1985, p. 335) are examples of Mirza Saleh’s obsession with records. I am not suggesting that such an approach is somehow unusual or exclusive to the group of travelers that I discuss here, rather I am trying to show how the image of Farangestan becomes connected to the idea of magnificence.
VIRTUAL REALITIES

Pretending to visit the King of England’s palace, the brothers took Rezaqoli to a wax museum (see Figure 22) where he confused a statue with the king (p. 438). The confusion of real and virtual reoccurs continuously in the travelers’ journey. As I discussed earlier in this chapter, at the early stages of their stay in Farangestan, most travelers expressed difficulty in distinguishing between paintings and reality. New artistic mediums that the travelers were introduced to, such as panoramas, dioramas, photography, and early cinematic devices, reinforced the illusionary nature of representation, which in some instances overwhelmed the travelers. Aminoddowleh (1994, p. 338), for example, after discussing how “it was impossible to tell the real from its image” in a theater, asserts that the experience “was mind boggling and eye popping.”
Rezaqoli (1839, p. 295) similarly expresses his astonishment about how indistinguishable “real and artificial” had become after he visited a panorama. Referring to the “artificial realities” of the panorama as a “miracle” and the show that he witnessed in a diorama as “magic” and “trickery,” Rezaqoli states “no one is able to identify whether these are representations or reality.” As Fraser (1973, p. 213) suggests, amazed by the optical delusion, illuminations, and the mysterious appearance and disappearance of the congregation of people in the show, the princes thought of the diorama as the most astonishing thing they had witnessed: “this is the finest and most wonderful [show] you have taken me to. Afereen! Afereen! This cannot be a picture; it must be reality!”

Another example that shows the magical influence of modern technology on the travelers is evident in Aminodowlleh’s description of a train. “The train moved so rapidly,” Aminodowlleh (1994, p. 189) writes, “that
nothing could sustain from the future and the present; everything was in the past tense."

Such experiences allude to a miraculous and magical perception of architecture by the travelers. Expressions such as a room that flies like a bird (Rezaqoli, 1994, p. 387), a glass house that can go deep under the sea (Rezaqoli, 1994, p. 397), walls and ceilings that moved in all directions (Rezaqoli, 1994, p. 462), floating cities (Rezaqoli, 1994, p. 301), domes that fly in the sky (Rezaqoli, 1994, p. 419), and gardens with four season fruits (Rezaqoli, 1994, p. 405) are not only because the travelers’ language lacks the vocabulary for an observatory, a diving bell (see page 140 and Figure 23), a ship, a balloon, and a horticultural garden; they rather suggest an architecture that transcends the idea of reality. This surreal and high-tech imagination of architecture drove the travelers to gradually abandon an in depth search for construction details behind architecture in favor of magical and virtual representation that conformed to their idea of Farangestan. This explains why Rezaqoli puts his description of what might have been an early version of a vehicle next to a magic apparatus:

We were also shown here a figure of a negro man made of iron, so ingeniously, that it could not be distinguished from a living man; two swords were made to appear to cut at his neck, through and through; and yet his head never falls. Also carriages and coaches made of iron, which go by themselves on roads of iron (Rezaqoli, 1839, p. 303).
Figure 23. Late 16th century miniature by Mukunda showing Alexander the Great being lowered in a glass diving bell, in *Khamsa* (Quintet) of Amir Khusrau Dihlavi

**REPRESENTING THE REPRESENTATION**

Taking part in the act of “representing” *Farangestan* through writing, the travelers tacitly understood that representation is tied to power. Aminoddowleh and Rezaqoli felt satisfaction in presenting their observations of *Farangestan* to the Ottoman officials, which made them enjoy the status of a *Farangestan* expert (Aminoddowleh, 1994, pp. 424, 426; Rezaqoli, 1994, p. 690). The very act of “representing” through writing provided the travelers with the power associated with
authorship, yet served as a means to resist the hegemony they felt by “being represented.”

Throughout their trip, the travelers were exposed to many objects of curiosity, which were themselves representations of other objects: art galleries, exhibitions, museums, panoramas, theaters, zoological gardens, botanical gardens, circuses, operas, and photo galleries. In a way, all these modes of representation demonstrated a hegemonic desire, a passion to control body and spirit, history and nature.

Among all the representations that fascinated Farangi people, one was closely tied to the travelers’ identity: representations of Iran. Aminoddowleh had encountered three occasions where Iran was exhibited: first, in a theater where cardboard models of Iranian women were milking sheep; second, in the Crystal Palace where a booth was dedicated to Iranian crafts; and third, in Schönbrunn Palace in Vienna where a room was supposedly designed and decorated in an Iranian fashion (Aminoddowleh, 1994, pp. 336, 343, 402).

Besides their culture, the travelers learned that they themselves were also an exhibit to the Farangi gaze. Fraser (1973, p. 83) recalls that Vali, the eldest Prince, had told him, “[w]herever I sit they will be sure to come fast enough. I am as great tamashah (raree-show) myself, as anything here.” Rezogoli (1994, pp. 320, 344, 593, 604, 628) reports that approximately 50 thousand people gathered to see the princes in Gibraltar, 10 thousand in Bath, 30 thousand in Enghien, 20 thousand in Liège, and 30 thousand in Vilshofen. Although the numbers may be exaggerated, both Fraser and Kayat confirm the fact that great crowds gathered to see the princes. Fraser (1973, p. 15), on his attempt to visit Liège with the princes, confesses that he had never seen so many people gather to see “any great or little man before.” He complains that the sight of the foreign costumes gathered such a crowd that forced them to turn back and give up the attempt. Sensing the gaze of Farangi people, the travelers felt like objects displayed in an exhibition.
Like Lacan’s (2006) idea of the mirror stage, the uncanny feeling of being an object of others’ gaze made the travelers conscious of their external existence. They understood how their appearance, clothing, customs, language, and history were constantly the subject of observation, analysis, and judgment. As Kayat (1847, p. 119) observed, “everything connected with the Princes was the subject of curiosity.” Upon returning from London to Bath, Kayat sees that “the house [was] full of people anxious to see the Princes, their swords, their caps, their slippers, their pipes, their horses' saddles, and their cook…” (Kayat, 1847, p. 119).

Sensing their selfhood through the European spectatorship, the travelers became more aware of their identity as the counterpart to Farangi people. The constructed duality of self/other thus grew further apart, which in result solidified the otherness of Farangestan. This duality, which seemed abstract at home, became real in Farangestan and imposed concrete consequences, the first being the higher prices that a foreigner should pay. Farangi vendors “have ‘two’ prices;” says Kayat (1839, p. 126), “and this I discovered by changing my dress and going out at night in an European garb.”

Although the travelers might have occasionally delighted to be the center of attention, they understandably detested being treated as an exhibit. Aminoddowleh (1994, pp. 173, 243), who self-promotingly represents the crowds that gather around him as a cheering entourage charmed by his presence, decides to dress in “Farangi outfits” in Italy in order to gain more “freedom” in his tour (p. 393). Mirza Saleh (1985, p. 150) indirectly complained about being constantly stared at by women, being chased by children, and being laughed at by crowds. In one event, crowds of people, gathered to rescue him after a coach accident, laughed at his appearance. Surprised by Mirza Saleh’s large bulk, long garb, and dyed beard, the crowd called him names such as “landlord of hell,” “archangel of torture,” and “messenger from the dead” (p. 350). To avoid the humiliation, Mirza Saleh pretended that he did not understand English and remained silent. Complaints about the degrading feeling of being an object of European curiosity are rare in
the travel accounts, nevertheless the travelers’ reactions tell their true feeling:

Crowds of people of this place [Bath], about ten thousand men and women, came below our house to look at us through the windows, where we were standing behind the glass. They continued to do this from morning until night. We, in order to satisfy their curiosity and get rid of their gazing, ordered our Persian servants to go out of doors, that they might see them. As soon as the servants went out, they were surrounded by vast crowds, about 20,000, and all the streets were full. At last the servants could bear it no longer, and were obliged to re-enter the house (Rezagoli, 1839).

Being close to the princes, Fraser provides insight into how the princes felt about becoming part of the never ending exhibit in Europe. Vali, as Fraser (1973, p. 87) puts it, “was rather provoked at being so constantly stared at, but bore it well on the whole.”

The exhibitionary nature of modernity, as Timothy Mitchell (1989) explained, was a celebration of the ordered world, the world ordered so as to represent. To represent, every object should be organized, engineered, controlled, calculated, and arranged to fit the “world-as-exhibition.” Everything was subject to this exhibitionary structure, from natural forces to wild beasts. Curiosity itself was to be displayed in such an order; there was an institutional order even for bizarreness. But whether in the zoo or in a masquerade ball the travelers could not escape being the focal object of curiosity, even compared to caged beasts and costumed people. At a cage of wild hogs in a zoo, the elder prince “was annoyed at the crowd of gazers; he could not find a spot to sit down upon in private (khelwut)” (1973, p. 96). Similarly, in a Caledonian ball and among all the people who had costumes, the princes, only wearing their regular Persian dresses, felt that all eyes were upon them (Fraser, 1973, pp. 103, 104). In a society where, as Steven Spielberg (1982) suggests in E.T., an extraterrestrial being can remain unnoticed in a Halloween party, attracting spectatorship requires a particular sort of oddity, i.e. being at odds.
with the exhibitionary order. As we understand today, and the travelers felt at the time, objects that did not comply with this imposing order represented backwardness.

Pursuing refuge from this imposed structure of representation, the travelers sought some kind of invisibility. Rezaqoli, who “experience[d] a sensation of shame, like one who knows he is committing an unworthy action,” as Fraser (1973, p. 104) suggests, frequently tried to “hide himself from view.” The travelers intuitively understood that, as Mitchel (1989) puts it, “[t]he ability to see without being seen confirmed one’s separation from the world, and constituted, at the same time a position of power.” Writing about their visit of a military maneuver in Rochester, Fraser (1973, p. 171) observes how the princes sought a location that would allow them to “view the manoeuvre at their ease... without being themselves exposed either to the heat of the sun or gaze of the crowd.”

The attempt to remain unnoticed would naturally cost the travelers to suppress the symbols of their selfhood: their appearance, their outfits, and their habits. Were they to dress in a European manner to escape the violation they felt by their voyeurs? Did this mean that they had abandoned their identity? These might seem as hypothetical questions posed a century and a half after the travels occurred, yet it was a real and serious concern to the travelers. Fraser (1973, p. 55) notes that Rezaqoli asked his opinion on this matter; “when you are going to take up your abode with any people, is it not well to adopt their costume, so that you may not be stared at? –you would not choose to be always an object to be pointed at by them?”

Two decades before this question, Mirza Saleh had come to his own conclusion:

once I entered the plaza [in Plymouth, England], suddenly the crowds [celebrating George III’s birthday], who had not seen anybody dress in such garments, gathered from all around, and in an instant, 500 people surrounded me. I escaped immediately, took
a carriage back home, redressed in English outfits, and returned to the event. No one bothered me anymore (Shirazi, 1985, p. 189).

The travelers sought invisibility from the Farangi gaze, which would often cost them their identity. Another strategy also enabled them to reclaim their power: the act of travel writing. Travel writing responded to the need to separate oneself from the world and to render it as an object of representation, and thus feel hegemony over an enchanted audience.

**THE REINCARNATED IMAGE**

During the following decades, as the mutual contact between Iran and Europe increased, the concept of Farangestan gradually conformed to a geographic image of the West. Nevertheless, the idea of the 19th-century Farangi wonderland reincarnated into a new body, “yenge donya.” Originating from the Azeri “yeni dünya,” the phrase literally means “the New World.” Yenge donya, as the Saturday Review (1876, p. 117) writes, was “the phrase for America current all over the east.”

Mirza Saleh (1985, pp. 243-249) dedicates several pages to introduce America, from its discovery to its independence. This description also includes a brief discussion of America’s geography, population, political system, religion, slavery, industry, and exports. Unlike Mirza Saleh’s similar historical and geographic writing on Britain, France, Russia, and the Ottoman Empire, the account on yenge donya seems quite out of place and irrelevant to his travel, which reveals his personal curiosity about the subject.

Rezaqoli’s curiosity in yenge donya is evident in his scattered mentions throughout the travelogue. America for Rezaqoli is a source of mystery. It is bigger than the other three corners of the world, surrounded by the most dangerous seas, and bordered on the north by dark cold territories, while its native inhabitants live in forests and caves and eat human flesh (Rezaqoli, 1839, pp. 146, 240). Rezaqoli saw America as an exotic land with wild nature, untouched landscapes, and rich mines of gold and silver. The most peculiar wildlife that he observed in horticultural and zoological gardens in Europe, either
gigantic plants or wild beasts, had come from yenge donya (Rezaqoli, 1994, pp. 370, 375, 377, 380, 519). America for Rezaqoli was a prosperous nation, whose industry would soon surpass Europe: “Because of the abundant land and water in yenge donya and the American states, people can cultivate any product. They have also adopted technologies and inventions from all nations” (Rezaqoli, 1994, p. 526).

And moreover, America is the symbol of progress and freedom:

There is more liberty and freedom in yenge donya than in England and France. This is the secret to their excessive progress as well as the reason why so many people from different countries migrate there. No technology or industry exists in Farangestan that is not better accomplished in yenge donya… Because of their liberty, freedom, and mashverat-e omum [public consultation or democracy] their strength shall soon surpass all countries. Some of their lands are still occupied by the British, the French, and the Spanish, yet not only shall they soon retrieve their land but also claim beyond their borders (Rezaqoli, 1994, pp. 573, 574).

Besides such information, there is a full detailed section about America in the English translation of Rezaqoli’s travel account that somehow does not exist in the original Persian publication. In the several pages dedicated to America (Rezaqoli, 1839, pp. 146-151), information about its discovery, geography, dimensions, population, and governing system is elaborated with such details as the lengths of major rivers, the heights of prominent mountains, and areas of main lakes.

Most travelers, who dedicated sections of their writing to descriptions of America, shared a dichotomous vision of yenge donya as both the land of utter savagery and the nation of ultimate civilization. The glue that stuck those contrasting images was in that both rendered a “wondrous” picture in total contrast with their cultural conception of “normal.” Yenge donya gradually replaces Farangestan, as the new medium for Iranians to project their fantasies of an exotic land.
To conclude this chapter on Farangestan, an excerpt from what Fraser had written to start his chapter on the princes’ journey to England is enlightening. Fraser, through a close observation of the many Persian travelers he interacted with, including Mirza Saleh, Ilchi, Rezaqoli, and Aminoddowleh gained a thorough insight on the imagined idea of Farangestan. Farangestan, he states,

is a world as distant almost, and as difficult of access, in the imagination of a Persian, as the moon might appear to us... The utter discrepancy between the manners and customs of Europe and those of the east, have tended strongly to allay the warmth of curiosity which has been excited by their narrative of its wonders. Then the idea of residence among Kaffers, —infidels,— combined with the oriental indolence of their nation, co-operate to widen the terrible gulf that in their imagination divides Persia from Europe (Fraser, 1973, pp. 50, 51).
CHAPTER IV: TRAVELS IN FARANGI SPACE

IMAGE OF THE CITY

The way an environment maps itself in one’s mind is what Kevin Lynch (1960) refers to as its “image.” Lynch argues that individuals perceive and navigate urban space through 5 mental elements: paths, landmarks, edges, nodes, and districts. These elements, which facilitate people’s mental orientation in the urban environment, were identified through case studies in the 20th-century US. Lynch, however, agrees that the five elements may change based on one’s cultural background.

The travelers I have studied clearly apply their culturally different elements to generate a mental map of the places they visit. While it is difficult to assert what elements build their image of the city, the major component of the urban structure in 19th-century Iran can shed light on the way they process the built environment. While, the socio-cultural heart of the city in the hot and arid regions of Iran is the Friday mosque, the bazaar serves as the economic structure of the city that connects the mosque to the different neighborhoods. The neighborhoods, which are identified through mental borders, are wrapped by the city walls (Habibi, 2003; Vahdat Zad, 2007). The Friday mosque, the bazaar, the neighborhoods, and the city walls, although roughly conform to Lynch’s landmarks, nodes, districts, and edges, fail to orient the travelers in Farangestan. To map the novel spatial elements that the travelers got exposed to in their voyage, their conventional mental tools to analyze space were inadequate.

For example, Mirza Saleh, while prior to reaching Tbilisi, examined each city that he visited by describing its minarets, schools, public baths, and citadels, finds such elements insufficient in providing an accurate image of the Farangestan cities.
THE ABSENCE OF FORM

The inadequacy of conventional methods to mentally formulate space shows itself in the spatial vocabulary used by the travelers. For instance, while mentions of form are surprisingly rare in the travel writings, in the few instances that architecture and urban form are mentioned, the word choices are either generic or poor. Mirza Saleh, as the only person who applied form to analyze and communicate spatial quality, had to construct the peculiar concept of “elongated square” to refer to the rectangular shape of the House of the Lords in Westminster, London (Shirazi, 1985, p. 268). His other mentions of form are limited to generic shapes such as the hexagon fortress of Peter and Paul in Saint Petersburg (see Figure 24), the octagon pool in Gardjola Garden, Malta, and the pentagon tombs in Erzurum, Turkey (Shirazi, 1985, pp. 109, 366, 418).

Figure 24. A 1730 plan of Peter & Paul Fortress by Burkhard Christoph von Münnich

The scarcity of descriptions of spatial form should not be considered as a mere matter of a limited linguistic pallet; it rather seems that association of form with architecture was alien to the travelers. Rezaqoli, for example, who uses many form-describing words such as
circle, trigon, tetragon, pentagon, and hexagon to describe shapes in fireworks (p. 410), never discusses the form of architectural spaces that he had witnessed. Compared to architectural spaces, urban layouts seemed to have a more clear formal image in the travelers’ minds; such is the case with Rezaqoli, whose descriptions of spatial form are limited to three city layouts, which to him resembled the shape of a triangle, millipede, and a crescent (pp. 185, 247, 701).

Similar is the case with townscapes. Not taking into account the two minor mentions by Mirza Saleh (1985, pp. 371, 408), Rezaqoli is the only person among the travelers who talks about savad-e shahr or the silhouette of the city in his memoir. As we learn from his travel account, Rezaqoli occasionally ascended the heights close to a city to get a better glance of the cityscape (Rezaqoli, 1994, p. 242). Rezaqoli’s description of silhouettes sometimes includes descriptions of its natural context, form, and elements like church towers, but in most cases is followed by a romantic longing for the beauty he observes.

**WIDE, PAVED, AND CLEAN**

As discussed in the previous chapter, the travelers gained more linguistic tools to express their insights on the built environment in the course of their voyage. Yet, their more vivid and complex vocabulary, instead of generating a more accurate picture of European space, lent to a better articulation of their own expectations of Farangestan.

For example, Mirza Saleh’s approach in evaluating streets is quite simplistic early in his writing; streets for him are either hamvar or nahamvar, even or uneven. In the writings of his voyage in Iran, which happened prior to his trip to Farangestan, as well as the part of his trip that happened in Turkey, Mirza Saleh (1985, pp. 20, 21, 24, 27, 411, 414) usually describes streets as rocky and rough, while in Russia and England he frequently uses the word hamvar to describe streets. Yet, as his trip advances, Mirza Saleh recognizes that the streets in
Moscow, “are wide, paved, and clean, while others are narrow and filthy” [emphasis added] (Shirazi, 1985, p. 78).

Precisely the same adjectives used by Mirza Saleh in the previous quotation are used 40 years later by Aminoddowleh to describe the streets of both Naples and Messina. These inseparable adjectives are, however, more than objective descriptions; they are a better articulation of what the travelers expected from an ideal street. For Aminoddowleh, wide, straight, and paved streets are synonymous with the good street. The phrase, for him, sits next to words such as desirable, excellent and good; in Antwerp, Belgium (see Figure 25), Aminoddowleh (1994, p. 305) describes the city as “a very desirable town with straight and paved streets, excellent buildings, and good stores.”

Figure 25. Old Antwerp

For Aminoddowleh, in this case and in many other examples, straight and paved have the same relationship to streets as desirable has to town, excellent to buildings, and good to stores. The value that straight, paved, and wide find in Aminoddowleh’s image of the ideal street is
rooted in the binarism of self and other. The organic layout of streets in premodern Persian cities, for example in Aminoddowleh’s hometown of Kashan (see Figure 26), are narrow and usually curved to adapt to the hot and arid weather conditions. Their narrowness allows for more shade and the curvature decreases the flow of dust storms. The streets are rarely paved which in rainy days, however seldom, become quite muddy. Aminoddowleh’s (1994, p. 185) general description of roads in Farangestan shows why he is so interested in pavement:

The effort that has been put on pavement is beyond human power. Vast areas of land are excavated and filled with lime and stone, so even if it rains all year long, there will be no sign of mud, holes or bumps.

Figure 26. An aerial photo of the old urban fabric of Aminoddowleh’s hometown, Kashan, showing the traditional street pattern and the later wide, straight, and paved streets that cut through the urban texture. Imagery ©2014 CNES / Astrium, Map data ©2014 google
Similar to Aminoddowleh, Rezaqoli finds a relationship between pavement and the drainage of excess rain and ground water. In Damascus, Rezaqoli (1994, p. 246) is content to see “all streets are paved with granite, so masterfully that no sewage will remain on it.”

Mirza Saleh’s multiple mentions of paved streets show that he also was fascinated by the idea of pavement. His discussions of the types and patterns of pavement, in instances where he talks about gravel pavement in Malta’s Gardjola Garden (Shirazi, 1985, p. 325) and the inlaid black and white marble in St. Paul’s Cathedral, London (Shirazi, 1985, p. 273) (see Figure 27), show that Mirza Saleh paid more attention to the details than Aminoddowleh.

Aminoddowleh however, had a more practical interest in streets and pavement. His notion of an ideal and progressive street reemerges later when, as the minister of the interior, Aminoddowleh gave orders to pave the streets surrounding the Royal Arg [citadel] of Tehran. Momtahenoddowleh (1974, p. 44), the first Iranian who studied architecture in Europe, mentions the streets in his memoir: “At that
time, Farrokh Khan Aminoddowleh, may his soul rest in peace, had ordered to pave the streets of the arg with polished cubic stones.”

Wideness, which serves as an important criterion in street evaluation for the travelers, also plays an important role in Iran’s history of urban planning. The street-widening act of 1933 (see Figure 28) was one of the very first planning attempts in Iran which resulted in the destruction of city walls and gates and construction of a network of wide streets that cut through the urban fabric (Vahdat Zad, 2013).

Figure 28. As a result of Tehran’s street-widening act of 1933, the city walls and gates were demolished in 1937 and replaced by wide streets

The qualities of Farangi streets that the travelers praise, minus the ones that they omit, such as “the eternal whirr! Birr! Jirr! Of its streets, with their thousand carts and carriages, and uproar” (Fraser,
1973, p. 284), renders an image that is not quite unfamiliar to the Iranian audience of the writings: the kucheh-bagh. Kucheh-bagh is basically a linear orchard aligned on the sides of an alleyway. Along the road the principles of char-bagh (Persian garden) are implemented. A fountain often runs in the middle of the Kucheh-bagh, which itself is embraced by two lines of trees on the sides (see Figure 29). The very same pattern is sought and presented by the travelers. Surrounding Beirut, Rezaqoli (1994, p. 279) asserts, “continuous kucheh-baghs exist, which instead of walls, are hedged with aloe.” Departing from Brussels, Rezaqoli (1994, p. 603) observes a similar pattern: “throughout the seven miles length of this street, large trees on both sides shade the whole path. What a pleasant place it was and what charming trees we saw.”

Figure 29. Char-Bagh of Isfahan, illustrated in Bruyn (1737), was designed by Sheykh Baha’i as part of the larger master plan of Isfahan in the early 17th century.
REFASHIONING THE FARANGI HOUSE

The most important notion about the house that reoccurs frequently in the travelers’ memoirs is that the idea of the house for them is inseparable from the courtyard. I shall discuss this further in the next section. The other important element of a Farangi house that came across before in Aminoddowleh’s description of Naples and Messina is the height of the building. This attention to height becomes more meaningful when we learn that upon return from Europe, Aminoddowleh builds his own house in Kashan, Iran, in three stories, which was quite unusual at its time. This building, which later became the “divan-khané” and the governor’s office, does not exist today.

As is the case with magnitude which I shall discuss on page 128, the travelers seem to be fond of the height of the buildings they visit. For every major city that Mirza Saleh visits, he includes a description of houses in his memoir that in most cases starts with the number of floors (Shirazi, 1985, pp. 115, 264, 314, 362, 404, 408) and follows by discussing their materiality. Farangestan for Mirza Saleh is mentally connected to the idea of multiple story buildings; when he visits İzmit in Turkey, Mirza Saleh (1985, p. 408) seems surprised to see “houses are built in a European manner in two or three stories.”

In the case of Aminoddowleh, not only does he regularly refer to the height of the buildings in Farangestan, but he clearly considers the Iranian buildings of his time as one story. “The layout of the buildings” of the ancient ruins of Naples for Aminoddowleh (1994, p. 171),

“is like in Iran. First, the houses are one story and each house has a courtyard and a reflecting pool in the middle… Each building has a separate andaruni [the private section of a house] and biruni [the common area]; not at all does it resemble the Farangestan design.”

To articulate his image of Farangestan as a desired future for Iran, Aminoddowleh accentuates the similarities between his contemporary architecture in Iran and the un-Farangi traditions that were once
practiced in Farangestan. By temporalizing the distance between Iran and Farangestan, Aminoddowleh could refurbish the pattern of progression of civilization that he witnessed in Naples as a roadmap for changes in Iran.

Another lesson that can be learned from the aforementioned quotation, is that in contrast to the rigid segregation between the private and public realm of a premodern Persian house, especially in the hot and arid regions, which manifests itself respectively in the andaruni (known as the harem in Arabic literature) and biruni, the “Farangestan design” of a house assumes no boundaries. The female members of the family, who symbolize the most private and precious “possessions” in a patriarchal society and should remain “safe” from the public, are exposed in Farangestan. As Tavakoli-Targhi (2001, p. 54) observes, in “Imagining European Women,” “the eroticized depiction of European women by male travelers engendered a desire for that heaven on earth and its inhibited and fairy-like residents who displayed their beauty and mingled with men.” This desire for the fairy-like residents of Farangestan is evident in the studied travelers, as for example Teymur Mirza and Ostad Mohammadali Chakhmaqsaz, one of the students who was on the same study-abroad mission as Mirza Saleh, fell in love in Europe, the latter case which lead to the couple’s marriage.

As the imagined Farangi woman is a projection of the Islamic hurí (the beautiful maidens that in Muslim belief live with the blessed in paradise), the Farangi architecture projects the Islamic paradise. And in this imaginary paradise, no separation of men and women, public and private, andaruni and biruni (see Figure 30), is acknowledged, even if it exists.

When Aminoddowleh (1994, p. 171) argues that by having “a courtyard and a reflecting pool in the middle,” the houses in Naples have no resemblance to the Farangi architecture style, he reveals that in his mental map of a house, the courtyard has central place. As implied in Aminoddowleh’s description, the Iranian traditional house of the hot and arid regions is spatially introverted and the central courtyard is hidden from the public. Although this is the case in many urban
apartments of, for example, Paris, Florence, and Brussels, the author seems to neglect them and instead pays more attention to the suburban villas of London, where the courtyard surrounds the mass of the house. Whether through means of unconscious adjustments or deliberate selection, Aminoddowleh tries to keep his notion of Farangestan consistent with his prior imagination and avoid rearticulating his understanding of Farangestan.
Figure 30. Example of the public-private division in Gerami house, Yazd, Iran.
**FARANGESTAN AS A PERSIAN PARADISE**

In every place [in London] there are excellent buildings, like heaven’s palaces, each sitting next to gardens (Rezaqoli, 1839, p. 371).

In the traveler’s minds the idea of a house is inseparable from the courtyard; and in many instances this relationship serves as a criterion to evaluate the quality of the space. As is the case of other travelers, in almost all of Aminoddowleh’s descriptions of houses, he first discusses the courtyard and typically follows with a remark on the trees (see pages 171, 179, 185, 174, 276, 279, 286, and 366). In fact, in many instances, the description of the garden comes before the actual building and takes the bigger portion of the description. Even when the place was a mad house, a social institute and an architectural typology that Aminoddowleh had never seen, and even though there was no sign of a garden in that asylum, Aminoddowleh (1994, p. 371) commences his description by discussing the flowers and birds painted on the wall.

Similarly, for Mirza Saleh a gardenless house is a peculiar and incomplete idea. But unlike Rezaqoli, quoted at the beginning of this section, Mirza Saleh (1985, p. 313) observes that, “English houses, especially those in London, have absolutely no garden. The high population and the expensive land price does not allow houses to exceed 6-7 zar’ [almost a meter] in width and 12 zar’ in length.” The contrasting image that the two travelers convey about the gardens of English houses results from their different social class. While Rezaqoli enjoys the status of a prince, he is exposed to suburban villas of English nobility (Rezaqoli, 1839, pp. 421, 476, 477, 482); Mirza Saleh however, describes the average English houses that he observes in London. Both people however share this belief that to explain the house, discussions of its garden is inevitable.

The garden, as it relates to one’s property, was a familiar and appreciated concept to the travelers, but as a public space, it was a totally unfamiliar and novel. The modern notion of public space, as I shall discuss on page 120, was not developed in Iran at the time and
the park, as the first public space that caught the attention of the travelers, became a source of their curiosity. Detailed accounts of botanical (Aminoddowleh, 1994, pp. 260, 264, 302, 307; Rezaqoli, 1994, pp. 351, 370; Shirazi, 1985, p. 324) and zoological gardens (Aminoddowleh, 1994, pp. 174, 262; Rezaqoli, 1839, p. 391) are found in all the studied travel accounts. In addition to their public use, what distinguished Farangi parks from Iranian gardens was the activities they hosted, ranging from fireworks to acrobatics.

Besides the private gardens and public parks, the travelers did not hesitate to ascribe the notion of the garden to natural landscapes that they visited in Europe (Aminoddowleh, 1994, p. 274; Rezaqoli, 1994, pp. 224, 632). Wide areas of the Iranian plateau have a hot and arid climate that does not allow for much natural greenery. The scarcity of water and the difficulty of maintaining gardens in the region make people appreciate nature even more. This explains why all travelers were so amazed that in many parts of Europe their “eyes did not see a single handbreadth of earth, but all covered with delightful green” (Rezaqoli, 1839, p. 251). When following this statement, Rezaqoli’s tone becomes poetic by describing how his path from Falmouth towards London was full of “roses and all kinds of flowers, guarded by the nightingales' singing.” He is in a sense communicating the shared feelings of the other travelers who were not equipped with his literary skills. Note that this is Rezaqoli’s first day in Europe, he has not seen a single city, he is travelling during the night, but he already calls it “the first story of paradise.”

The travelers studied here, especially Rezaqoli and his brothers, have a strong desire for natural landscapes. The brothers, who appear to be outdoor enthusiasts, constantly seek to escape from the city into nature. This we learn from Fraser (1973, pp. 175, 273), who in several cases discusses how tired of London the princes were and how much they desired to leave it and spend their time in the county. For instance, when the brothers were visiting Major Willock, who had been ambassador to Persia for twenty years, at his house upon the Thames at Putney, Fraser reports that,
the princes were delighted with the situation, the running stream and the cool freshness of the air. ‘Vah! Vah!’ Said they, snuffing it up, and running from flower to flower like bees or butterflies, ‘who would live in London, with all its dust, and its heat… when they could come to such a place like this? This is the true spot for dwelling; here you have the full Dil-gousha—the opening of the heart; one dies of pleasure here’ (1973, p. 175).

Not only did the travelers prefer the natural environment to a modern urban setting, they also wanted to domesticate it by practicing their own habits in the gardens. Fraser’s report of the party held at Willock’s house continues by a quotation from the prince: “‘Ah! [T]here is the spot for us, there, just under these trees: now a carpet on the grass, and plenty of good wine,—that is the way we should do in Persia’” (1973, p. 176). At the horticultural gardens at Chiswick, we can see the same attempt to domesticate the foreign concept of the garden. Again, as the eldest prince “walked upon the velvet turf, and went up to the rose-bushes, every flower and bud of which he touched and petted with his hands, and expressed considerable satisfaction,” he said,

if this were Persia now, how differently would these people be employing themselves on this turf, which is like velvet, and among this gush of flowers and rich verdure! Not one spot, not a bush would there be without its party seated in the shade, drinking their wine to the sound of instruments (1973, pp. 85-87).

With this background, it is not hard to imagine that a significant portion of Rezaqoli’s diary is dedicated to detailed descriptions of majestic gardens, splendid flowers, fresh air, excellent fountains, fine fruits, red roses, singing nightingales, elegant trees, and colorful blossoms. These descriptions, which are repeated all along the diary, usually have a poetic tone. Rivers like the rosewater that runs down the cheeks of virgins, flowers sending forth a delightful odor, and the scent of blossoms that like the breath of Jesus nourish the soul, are examples of Rezaqoli’s romantic longing for natural landscape. Even Mirza Saleh (1985, p. 32), who insisted on a cold
scholarly tone, could not escape the temptation of a tender longing when writing about gardens. Appropriately, Mirza Saleh’s (1985, p. 182) only use of poetry in his writing is in relation to his description of a natural landscape in Exeter. This glorification of nature is an attitude shared by all travelers that reflects their pastoral image of a utopia.

Among their observations of gardens, the controlled nature-like environments of the greenhouses came as shock to the travelers: the fact that “peculiarly, all flowers and plants and every kind of fruit from all seasons and all regions of the world were cultivated in these gardens” (Rezaqoli, 1839, p. 351). These dreamlike qualities were actually more familiar than what the travelers initially thought; they gradually recognized how it resembled the Garden of Eden in Islamic religious texts. No wonder the travelers constantly used the metaphor of paradise to describe gardens and parks (Rezaqoli, 1994, pp. 383, 391, 408, 422, 427, 624, 682; Shirazi, 1985, pp. 29, 31, 32, 324, 325). Interestingly, when describing these gardens, the travelers do not talk about qualities that distinguish such parks from their utopian notion of gardens in Persian literature and Islamic texts. Actually, in some instances, they twist the reality to conform to their expectation of heaven. Rezaqoli, for example, when talking about Vauxhall garden in London, suggests that in these public gardens men could flirt freely with any women they desired, starting with one, and once uninterested, experiencing another (Rezaqoli, 1839, p. 409).
The plan of most residential buildings in the pre-modern architecture of Iran shows the importance of the courtyard in Persian architecture. It is the central part of a house and the only space that is designed as a perfect rectangle, while other spaces seem to be formed through the leftovers of the site (see Figure 30). The courtyard as a small microclimate in the house even finds a more important role in the hot and arid regions of Iran (see Figure 31). Symbolizing the Persian charbagh and the Islamic heaven, the garden finds a paradisiacal dimension. Because Farangestan becomes associated with progress, its spaces are idealized through the same mentality that respects the garden as a symbol of heavens:

Figure 31. An aerial view of Shazdeh garden in Mahan, Iran that shows how gardens function as a microclimate within their harsh climatic setting (from Google Map)
Shaddad’s paradise, mentioned in the history books [in Persian literature, Shaddad is famous for his mythical garden-city known as the Iram, or the City of a Thousand Pillars], is only a sample of this building. Upon my entrance to the building and observing the situation, I was so astonished that I couldn’t realize where I was and what has happened. It was the flower garden of Iram, on each side the beautiful branches and leaves of trees embracing each other and different flowers, while their leaves were weaved together, fresh and joyful, and colorful birds singing on different cords, and glass fountains jumping high on all sides (1994, p. 340).

For a 19th-century reader of the book, the above description associated directly with an idealized Persian garden. I can imagine that even the 21st century audience of these lines is surprised when realizing that the passage is describing Joseph Paxton’s celebrated Crystal Palace (see Figure 32). The icon of modern architecture for Aminoddowleh, as evident in the passage above, is not astonishing because it was world’s largest enclosed building, nor because of its cast iron structure, not even for its massive use of glass; but because it synchronizes with the archetype of a Persian garden in Aminoddowleh’s unconscious. The author’s perception of the space and how it is skewed by his expectations in this case is even more interesting because he was writing the memoirs on the spot:

I stopped and moved away from my companions. I took my pen and paper and decided to walk on a straight line from where I was towards the end of the building and restart a detailed observation of the building again while I write (1994, p. 341).
The words behesht, Rezvan, and Jenan, all meaning heaven(s), are repeated more than 50 times in Rezaqoli’s (1994) memoir, demonstrating how the ideal of a garden influenced his perception of spaces. Rezaqoli’s application of such phrases is so recurrent that at the beginning of the English translation of the book, Kayat (Rezaqoli, 1839, p. 129) feels obliged to explain, “[a]s this phrase will be used often in the narrative, the translator begs to assure his readers that this is the highest mode and the strongest style of expressing beauty of faces, &c.”

The common ascription of heaven occurs when the travelers experience spaces that possess a pastoral quality, one with abundance of greenery, picturesque springs, divine music, red wine, and fine-looking women. “The green land and the fresh breeze of the outskirts of Damascus,” as Rezaqoli (1994, p. 224) suggests,

were like heaven. From each side, we saw colorful scenes, and from each corner, we heard harmonious chords. Twenty thousand men
and women, with no hijab, were mingling cheerfully and flirting joyously. Fountains were gushing on all sides of this green paradise; sitting next to them were crystal cups full of red wine.

Figure 33. Astley's Amphitheatre in London, painted by Thomas Rowlandson and Augustus Pugin, 1808-11

Figure 33 illustrates Astley's Amphitheatre in London, a space that for Rezaqoli resembles the paradise. Although it has no sign of the gardenlike greenery, what seems to have triggered the paradiisical imagery is "the bare-breasted women with faces as bright as the full moon, their beauty exceeding the huris." The huri, or the fairylike companion of devoted Muslims in heaven, explain why in many instances the metaphor of a heaven was also used to manifests spaces such as boulevards (Aminoddowleh, 1994, p. 190), palaces (Rezaqoli, 1994, pp. 602, 624), squares (Aminoddowleh, 1994, pp. 217, 293), residential buildings (Aminoddowleh, 1994, p. 276; Rezaqoli, 1994, pp. 476, 482),
theaters (Rezaqoli, 1994, pp. 429, 637), and even an observatory (Shirazi, 1985, p. 321).

The idea of seeing faragenstan as a heavenly utopia solidifies the binaries of self and other in a rather different context. Of course, in this framework, Iran is seen as backward and Farangestan as a progressive heaven, but the difference lies in the more conventional connotation of Farangi to the infidel, as used in classic Persian literature (Ghanonparvar, 1993). Astonished by the performance of “The Siege of La Rochelle” in the London Opera house, Rezaqoli assert, “It truly has nothing less of heaven itself. How true is Hadith that says ‘the world is the prison of the Believer, and the Paradise of the Infidel.’” In the later encounters with Farangestan, this segregation between the material progress and the cultural aspects of modernity is accentuated, often suggesting the emulation of the first and rejection of the latter. In the case of the early travelers this distinction is rare, yet Rezaqoli makes his choice clear by quoting a poem from Hafez (1999):

For nymphs and Paradise, some find the rosary,
Beloved is my nymph, and tavern my garden’s entry.

THE LOOKING GLASS

Opposite to the mentioned room [the royal living room in the Winter Palace, Saint Petersburg] Neva River and its many ships are observable. In addition to the state and prominence of the royal house, the view of the river adds much to its charm (Shirazi, 1985, p. 111).

Unlike what one would expect when learning about the travelers’ attraction to natural landscapes, discussions of window views are rare in their writings. Mirza Saleh’s (Shirazi, 1985, pp. 111, 188, 325, 371) occasional statements about views are always when the view is facing either the river or the sea. Although Rezaqoli discusses views only twice in his memoir, he notices that house design in London is different from the spatially introverted layouts of Iranian houses in the hot and arid region, which have no view to outside. All the houses
in London, he suggests, “have windows with glass, looking to the streets” (Rezagoli, 1839, p. 22). Aminoddowleh (1994, p. 405) only mentions view once in his memoir when he visits Sanssouci, Frederick the Great’s summer palace in Potsdam, Prussia (see Figure 34).

![Figure 34. The Sans-Souci Palace in the 19th Century](image)

Windows in the context of this study show more than their direct view. They mirror the desires of those looking through them, which in the case of the Iranian travelers was fascination in the fenestrated and extroverted architectural design and passion for natural landscapes.

**REFLECTING A DIFFERENT SKY**

Water plays a central role in the hot and arid regions of Iran. The focal point of the charbagh concept in Persian Garden is water. As evident in Figure 30 and in Aminoddowleh’s perception of Iranian houses, the reflecting pool sits in the middle of the courtyard. In this region, where water is scarce, shallow but large pools store water
for the gardens, provide humidity in the space, and reflect the greenery and the sky. In the studied diaries, however, pools reflect a desire that has lost its meaning outside of its original context. With the abundance of rivers, and lakes, and seas in Farangestan it is not a surprise to learn that the travelers made little mentions of unnatural pools. In his 30 page writing about his travels in Iran, Mirza Saleh (1985, pp. 7, 10, 12, 13, 14, 27, 30, 31, 32) discusses pools 10 times, while in his travel to Europe not a single mention can be detected.

Rezaqoli’s remarks on reflecting pools are also limited; yet, Fraser’s account shows that the Prince’s appreciation of water has not faded. At Liege’s countryside, the princes stopped “to babble at every little water course and spring by the roadside” (Fraser, 1973, p. 16). Evidently, Fraser, trying to explain (somewhat sarcastically) the princes’ attraction towards fountains, had also come to the same conclusion mentioned at the beginning of this section: “We took one or two excursions to a country-house near town [Bucharest], belonging to one of the prince’s family, and to which they took a fancy, because it had a fountain of good water, and resembled somewhat their own disorderly Persian gardens” (Fraser, 1973, p. 160).

**FICTIONAL FUNCTIONALITY**

Traditional architecture of the Islamic region is often known for its nonfunctional division of space. In other words, unlike its European counterpart, the spaces are not designated to accommodate specific functions such as dinning, sleeping, or sitting. Surely, bathrooms, kitchens, and storages exist, yet, assigning a specific behavioral functions or a specific person to a room is considered as a waste of resources, especially in common residential buildings. The rooms rather have the potential to fit multiple functions when needed, a quality that Gibson (1966) would call “affordance.” For example, to conform to the nomadic life inside the house or to accommodate the extended family, the spaces have the affordance to adopt new behavioral patterns in each season or based on new users.
In the studied memoirs, descriptions of functional division of space are expectedly rare and often imply the author’s slight amazement. Mirza Saleh, through explaining a typical apartment in London, explains how spaces are divided based on functions, what the functions are, and how they are distributed in the different levels of the building. Interested in how each person has a separate bedroom, he tries several times to communicate the idea to his audience. Different from the andaruni/biruni division of Iranian houses, in the English apartments, Mirza Saleh (1985, p. 314) explains,

the first level is dedicated to storage and a space for the kitchen... All cooking devices are provided in the kitchen. Second floor has a room where lunch and dinner are served, they don’t often reside in that room, except when it’s time to have lunch or dinner. Third floor is the living space for the residents and also the place where other people come and go... The library and the bedrooms, as well as children’s and maids’ rooms are located in the fourth and fifth floor. The sixth and occasionally the seventh floor is where the servants reside. Each household has a specific room for sleeping. Everything, whether sleeping, sitting, or cooking, has a separate room... Every person’s has a separate sleeping room.

For Rezaqoli, functional division of architectural space is a luxurious quality. To his amazement, the first building that he resides in, a hotel in Exeter, has a separate room for bathing, dining, and sleeping. “The building,” Rezaqoli (1994, p. 335) describes, “is magnificent. Comprised of many apartments, each royally furnished house has a separate room for bathing and a distinct place for dining. Every traveler is shown to a room to himself, attended by a servant. I was struck with amazement.” Even in Windsor Castle, Rezaqoli (1994, pp. 425-427) cannot hide his astonishment when he observes rooms dedicated to dancing, books, and dining. It is only in his visit to the Foreign Office that Rezaqoli (1994, p. 505) comprehends how different offices and departments can facilitate the management of complex functions.
The management of complex functions through design program and spatial organization is also observed by Aminoddowleh. In his visit to the Hôtel de Ville in Paris (see Figure 35), Aminoddowleh gives a thorough account of how different rooms are intended for different functions. “One section of this complex,” he (1994, p. 207) describes,

is specified for the mayor [Baron Haussmann] and his dependents. To be more specific, the first floor is assigned to his wife and children, the second floor to parties and serves as a reception for ambassadors and the noble visitor from different countries who come to see Paris. The third floor is intended for municipal office-work of almost one hundred clerks... A section of the building is designated for big ceremonies, where the huge population of the city dwellers can gather and enjoy the events. A part is for the city council, a part for the experts, and a part for writers and administrators.

Aminoddowleh, with a slight sense of amazement, even mentions a big room where the servants collected and stored the visitor’s coats. The increasing mentions of space functions such as the reception, dancing room, and dining room in the course of Aminoddowleh’s journey, show how Aminoddowleh (1994, pp. 200-204) was mastering a new analytical tool to evaluate architecture.
Despite the overall poor description of “architectural” functions, the travelers were very attentive to mention “urban” functions. In the sections of his writings, where Mirza Saleh educates his readers about different cities, his categorization system is based on urban typologies, such as churches, parks, museums, schools, bridges, and theaters. Aminoddowleh mentions the urban typologies that he encounters from the very beginning of this trip. These typologies for Aminoddowleh represent the modern institutions that he is eager to learn about and possibly implement in Iran. The typologies that Aminoddowleh (1994, p. 169) mentions in Naples, which is the second place he visits in Europe, include all the ones that he notes during his travel:

A big city, a fine port, and perfect buildings, four to five stories, with wide and straight streets paved with stone, neat and clean. Magnificent building of different types such as hotels, schools, fine old churches, hospitals, extremely clean
cafés, and a theater that is among the first buildings of Farangestan.

Listing all the typologies right after the very first and short encounter with a European city shows how the items emerge out of Aminoddowleh’s previous imagination of Farangestan, which he can now happily check off one by one. Surprisingly, little adjustment is made to the list during Aminoddowleh’s one and a half year trip in Europe. These typologies that the travelers mention excitedly in their memoirs are later listed in a different document, the law on municipal governance known as Ghanun-e Baladiyeh. In the fifth, ninth, and tenth articles of the law, which was passed in June 1907 by the first parliament of Mashruteh, the municipality becomes responsible to assist the government in the construction of hospitals, asylums, nursing homes, libraries, museums, work houses, and expositions (Tavakoli-Targhi, 2009, p. 451).

**THE BREATHING CITY**

The travelers’ contemporary architecture in Iran is today famed for its sustainable design. Sustainable design in the premodern architecture of Iran is primarily manifested in the use of local material. Another major contribution of this architecture to energy conservation is the division of space into winter and summer sections. The winter space consists of thicker walls and lower ceilings and benefits from the greenhouse effect caused by the orosi, i.e. a large latticed window facing the maximum daily sunlight, which in the north hemisphere is the southwest. The summer spaces, known as talar, are often open from one side but always remain shaded. Also, during extreme weather condition, the underground rooms, which are thermally more controlled, can be accessible through a form of vertical nomadism. The premodern architecture of Iran has also introduced structural innovations such as badgir, a wind catching tower erected upon the summer section of a house, qanat, subterranean water distribution system, yakhchal, a structure that produces and store ice, and kabutar-khan, pigeon towers that collect pigeon dung to use as fertilizers.
The travelers had experienced such architectural measurements in the use of natural resources in their homeland and, therefore, showed to be environmentally conscious and quite sensitive towards sustainable design. In the urban level, Mirza Saleh (1985, p. 293) mentions how squares and open spaces allow the city to breathe and keep its air purified. In the architectural level, he mentions how houses Istanbul are kept cool in the summer and how moisture is controlled in London’s apartments (Shirazi, 1985, pp. 264, 404).

Rezaqoli also observes such signs of sustainable architecture in the first European city he visits, Gibraltar. The houses, he explains, “are designed in a fashion that collects the winter rain from the mountain and the desert. All this water is distributed among houses, not a single drop is wasted. Throughout the whole year, they can drink fresh rain water” (Rezaqoli, 1994, p. 319).

**THE BRIDAL CHAMBER**

It was one thousand times neater and more organized than a bridal chamber (Aminoddowleh, 1994, p. 182).

Concepts of cleanliness and order, as indicated in the above quotation, where Aminoddowleh is describing a train car, are deeply appreciated, yet somewhat absent, in the Islamic-Iranian culture that the travelers belong to. They seek it everywhere in Farangestan but are still so amazed to mention every instance in their writing, whether “the order and cleanliness” of soldiers apartments, the military equipment “configured in a full order and a clean design,” a garden that is “excessively ordered,” or “the ordered and symmetrical fashion” that children are seated in a church, (Fraser, 1973, p. 244; Rezaqoli, 1994, pp. 318, 351, 358).

The recurrent mentions of cleanliness in the 19th-century travel accounts are especially relevant to this study when one considers that “everyday modernity in Iran,” as Tavakoli-Targhi (2009, pp. 421-422) puts it,
started with attempts to combat contagious diseases... The early foundations of Iranian modernity was laid on state-initiated sanitary projects, such as paving roads, building public toilets, sweeping streets, collecting garbage, and moving cemeteries, slaughter houses, and tanning houses out of the urban living quarters.

Such modern urban projects, as Tavakkoli shows, were measures taken by the state to respond to the everyday sanitary needs of its society. "The state officials," as a reported in a newspapers article in 1851, "have made great efforts to keep Tehran clean; they have assigned officers to monitor garbage and trash [all around the city]" (Editorial, 1851). These urban services and regulations were not limited to the capital. In Hamedan, the same newspaper reports, "[officials] have mandated to relocate slaughter houses outside the city... also to sweep the streets, dispose the garbage, and keep the houses, streets, and neighborhoods clean" (Editorial, 1853). All these urban regulations and services as means to keep the city clean were enforced because pre-pasteurian medicine assumed that "cholera was caused by city filth" (Editorial, 1853).

Early modernization projects in Iran were a result of public demand for regulating sanitation in urban space. This demand was echoed decades before when the travelers reported on the experiences of Farangestan in regulating cleanliness. Understandably, the regulatory order of Farangi institutions fascinated the travelers more than the purpose of the system. What struck Rezaqoli and his brothers at Bethlem penitentiary (see Figure 36) was its "remarkable cleanness and good order," not the details of "this admirable regulated establishment," as Fraser (1973, pp. 250, 255) expected. Similarly Vali found the fact that "hundred musicians strike the same note at once... more surprising than the music they make" (Fraser, 1973, p. 157).

The brothers were particularly enchanted by what Siegfried Kracauer calls "mass ornament." While they could not understand the plot of an opera, the brothers where astonished by the orderly performance of the corps de ballet: "what women! what dresses they have, and what waists! what bosoms! and all alike too – all as if they had been cast in one
mold! And how their steps all go together! Wonderful indeed! this is Behisht (Paradise)” (Fraser, 1973, p. 122). Similarly, “the rapid precision with which every movement and manoeuvre was performed” in the grand review of a military display at Hyde park, as Fraser (Fraser, 1973, p. 112) suggests, “strike and astonished the Persians.” This “admirably calculated” performance of 50 thousand troops and officers allude to mass ornament through mathematical movements of bodies that are de-individualized into assemblage of geometries.

Figure 36. 1828 engraving of the Bethlem Hospital in London

For Mirza Saleh cleanliness, although substantially important, is part of the general theme of following some kind of higher order. After providing a detailed and fairly objective description of Saint Petersburg, Mirza Saleh (1985, p. 144) communicates his personal feeling about the city by stating “truly, I have never seen a city so good, pleasant, clean and organized in my life”.

Aminoddowleh similarly sees an inherent connection between organization and cleanliness and thus in many cases he uses notions such as pak,
monagqah, pakizeh, pirasteh, arasteh, ba-mizan, ba-tartib, ba-nezam interchangeably. This wide range of vocabulary related to cleanliness (the first three words) and orderliness (the latter five words) shows their importance in the culture that has produced them.

However, the concepts are not repeated in the travelers’ memoirs as frequently as for example firmness. It seems that the value of cleanliness is so obvious to the travelers as well as their audience that they do not expect Farangestan to be otherwise. Actually, the very few instances that Aminoddowleh is critical in the entire journey are moments that the described objects do not meet his criteria of cleanliness and order. Referring to the furniture in a Thai chamber in Buckingham Palace, Aminoddowleh (1994, p. 334) complains, “although everything was expensive, they all lacked proportion, configuration, and scale. Nothing among them was approvable.” “Proportion” and “configuration” are the exact concepts that Rezaqoli finds missing in a gipsy tent in Kazerun, Iran, which explains how disappointed Aminoddowleh had become to see in Farangestan what he considers as signs of backwardness. Aminoddowleh (1994, p. 416) can expect seeing streets “full of dirt” in the “extremely filthy city” of Dardanelles, but surely not in Farangestan.

As el-Enany (2006) has shown in the case of “Arab representations of the occident,” the first encounters of Arab novels with modern West are enchanted encounters. In the early Iranian travel writings about Europe, this pattern manifests itself in the glorification and romanticizing the imagined Other, which serves as a temporal destination for the self. Thus, critical perception of the Other that may damage the perfection of the preimagined utopia, are often unconsciously avoided. Therefore, negative comments, as scarce as they might be, should nevertheless be studied and analyzed carefully. Civitavecchia is another unprecedented example in Aminoddowleh’s (1994, p. 395) travelogue where he points out negative aspects of Farangestan. One possible explanation might be the influence of his French (Farangi) companion who seemed to be complaining about his previous trip to the city:
At dawn, we got aboard and we arrived at one of Rome’s ports, called Civitavecchia. It was a small port with a population of six or seven thousand. Its people are the most villainous people in the world. All were beggars, rude, and uncivil like the people of Karachi and Abbas-dust. There was no sign of order and regulation among them. In all the alleys they asked for money. A French person who was our fellow traveler complained that during his two month travel, he had spent 24 tomans on the beggars [Emphasis added].

Here order and regulation are associated with civilization and progress, yet for the travelers, they entailed a deeper connection to the concept of freedom. “In all cities of England, wherever we visited,” Rezagoli (1994, p. 525) believes, “there is no guardianship and no sovereignty, because people act rationally and orderly... Their land is all freedom and liberty.” This conception of freedom is later embodied in the 1906 mashruteh movement, which led to the establishment of the first parliament in Iran. Many historian agree that the priority of the movement was not democracy nor individual rights, but constitution and the sovereignty of law (Tabatabai, 2008).

ARCHITECTURE AND URBAN REGULATIONS

Who can even imagine that the Prince Regent, who is practically the king of the city and, except for lacking the crown, his deeds and commands have the same authority of the king’s, has constructed a road in Oxford Street, and a craftsman, an impoverished person, who owns a shop in the middle of the street, is resisting all their attempts to construct the road through his shop? If hypothetically, the whole army gathers, they cannot force him to abandon his property. Funny enough, the Prince himself cannot threaten the person physically or financially (Shirazi, 1985).

As part of the idea of order, urban and architectural regulations are reflected in some of the travel accounts. Although the travelers do not explicitly mention the institutional aspects of space design and
management, they usually hold this belief that everything including space in Farangestan follows some kind of underlying order, or in Mirza Saleh’s words enzebat and entezam (Shirazi, 1985, pp. 30, 64, 110, 281, 368). Holding a similar pattern, descriptions of journeys to Europe that were published in Cairo, as Mitchell (1989) shows, “devote hundreds of pages to describing the peculiar order.”

Hence, when Mirza Saleh, who tries to remain objective, encounters moments that do not conform to his preconception of architectural order he feels obliged to explain that, for example, “buildings [in Moscow] do not follow any order” (Shirazi, 1985, p. 78). In his first mention of architectural regulations, Mirza Saleh makes sure to communicate the gradual process as well as the reason behind the code, which is not as present in other travel accounts. Istanbul, Mirza Saleh (1985, p. 402) explains, “has experienced multiple major earthquakes that have caused great damage to the city. Today an officer is assigned to inspect building heights so that they do not exceed 8 zar’.” On the process of rebuilding Saint Petersburg, Mirza Saleh (1985, p. 110) similarly suggests, “the houses were built from wood, some of which burnt; an order was issued that whoever wants to build a house should use brick and stone. Gradually all walls were constructed from brick and stone.” He even gives a more detailed explanation when discussing the regulations for rebuilding London after the Great Fire of London (Shirazi, 1985, p. 262). In Saint Petersburg, Mirza Saleh also notices that every property owner is responsible for paving part of the street that the property sits beside. With this regulation, Mirza Saleh (1985, p. 110) suggests, “all the street are now paved with stone.”

Rezaqoli (1839, p. 256) also feels the guiding presence of an inclusive plan that governs the underlying order of Bath’s urban design:

the streets are very large, about 100 feet broad, all capitably paved with a kind of marble stone, very clean, and exceedingly pleasant… There are in the streets, on both sides, separate sidewalks, for those that pass on foot, so that they are never interrupted by carriages or horses, which have their separate path, and they do not interfere with each other. [One side is for
incoming and the other for outgoing traffic.] The houses are lofty; 100 feet in height; their walls are glazed and look like glass, and all of them are straight to a hair. [The doors on each side of the street are symmetrically located in front of each other.] The names of the inhabitants are either written on the door of the house, or else the doors are numbered. Every street has its name.

Rezaqoli (1994) also shows a general understanding of “zoning” when he states that “all the industry and factories of London are located outside the city.”

Aminoddowleh has a similar preconception about Farangestan’s architecture that reflects itself at the early stages of his arrival to France. On the second day of his arrival, writing about what he had observed during his train travel from Lyon to Paris, Aminoddowleh (1994, p. 185) states that “all that is built, such as villages, gardens, and houses, follows a certain size and order.” This he believes is, “because in this nation, no one can build a structure arbitrarily unless approved by the state and compatible with the plan of the state architects. This is why all the villages, cities, gardens, farms, and roads have an architectural design.” Such observations form an underlying agenda to Aminoddowleh’s legitimization of state power in the built environment, especially when he takes charge of many urban developments in Tehran, once he is appointed as the minister of the interior in 1859.

Aminoddowleh’s observation on the architectural design behind the built environment in “this nation” does not get elaborated in the rest of the travelogue. Aminoddowleh neither discusses the details nor does he indicate the source of his information. We can assume that he has either heard this from one of his French companions or he is simply formulating a personal postulation, which is now supported by actual evidence.

The most detailed explanation of planning regulations is in Mirza Saleh’s memoir where from the street patterns in London, he notices an
underling order. “Most streets of London,” Mirza Saleh (1985, p. 263) explains,

are built with order, meaning the houses are symmetrical, walls have brickwork, at the entrance of each street the name of the street and district is scripted, and on each house door its number is written in English. The streets are wide enough to accommodate the transportation of four coaches. Both sides are paved for pedestrians. The middle is dedicated to horses, wagons, and coaches. On each side of the street, following a 6 to 10 zar’ distance, a lantern is fixed above the doors which burns all night.

Occasionally, the travelers’ imagination about the state of regulatory order surpasses reality. They inductively assign every pattern they identify to an imaginary code, often enforced by the state. For example, in his discussion of the Winter Palace in Saint Petersburg (see Figure 37), Mirza Saleh asserts that the living room in Farangestan houses are located on the second floor.

[T]he mentioned house has multiple floors above each other; and because the code in Farangestan is that they locate their living area on the second floor, we visited the same floor (Shirazi, 1985, p. 110).

Figure 37. The view of the Winter Palace from the Admiralty (1814)
THE HIGH SPACE

About people’s clothing, for men, there is no difference in outfits of the nobility, the merchants, and craftsmen in this land [England]. For women, except for king’s wives and the aristocracy who wear different outfits, other ladies including ones of high ranks, the gentry, and workers have no difference (Shirazi, 1985, p. 317).

Most travelers, although coming from a high socio-economic class, showed fascination with the idea that in Farang all people, even persons of rank, “are clad alike and there is no distinction in dress” (Rezaqoli, 1839, p. 62). Even Rezaqoli, who as we learn from Fraser (1973, p. 271), did not tolerate any disrespect of his “high pretensions” and his “rank of birth,” appreciated the idea that the king of great Britain, “goes incognito about the streets, conversing with whom he pleases, and even should he be discovered to be the king, he would only be respected as a private gentleman” (Rezaqoli, 1839, p. 90).

Unlike their approach towards clothing, the travelers showed no interest in similar pattern in architecture. Democratization of space, in a sense that integrates people regardless of their social class, was not recognized in their diaries. In fact, the travelers had a good eye in tracking the spatial hierarchies. Strongly manifested in the traditional architecture of Iran, spatial hierarchy depicts the social status in an authoritarian society. All spaces in such society have a value that corresponds with power relations of a patriarchal structure. The best space in a Persian architecture, called shah-neshin, literally meaning the king’s throne, is designated for the guests or the elderly members of the family. Even locations around a dining cloth have specific hierarchical value, which, as in English, is signified with notions of high and low.

Rezaqoli (1994, p. 394), notices a “bizarre tradition” among the members of the royal family, “they do not sit at the head of the assembly and there is no distinction between high and low [spaces].” Nevertheless, as Fraser (1973, p. 271) occasionally complains in his
diary, Rezaqoli always demanded “a suitable place” in the parties that he was invited to and if his expectation was not granted, he would feel undignified.

Sarabi (1994, p. 52), trying to show the respect that Aminoddowleh received by the foreign minister of the Ottoman empire, states, “the foreign minister greeted Aminoddowleh and offered him a seat on the top, right next to himself” [Emphasis added]. The association of space height with its social value, which emerges from such a background, can be tracked in Aminoddowleh’s architectural descriptions. His description of Ecole Militaire shows the attention to and acceptance of the spatial segregation of social classes. “The surrounding below and above rooms,” according to Aminoddowleh (1994, p. 286) are respectively “designated for the teachers, administrators, and directors and for the servant and laborers.”

Even ideas of procession in space and symmetry for Aminoddowleh, who himself enjoys a “high” social status, symbolize power and centralization. For example when describing the concluding day of the parliament (see Figure 38) of England Aminoddowleh (1994, p. 250) explains,

> it was a perfect and old building and it had a huge room designated for this purpose; and at the top was a shah-neshin and in the middle of the shah-neshin, a seat for her highness the queen, and the royal crown was suspended from above, and on the right was a seat for the queen’s husband. And all around the room were parts for the public [Emphasis added].
Almost half a century before Aminoddowleh writes about the king’s seat in the House of Lords, Mirza Saleh (1985, p. 268) also visited the space:

On one side lays the House of Lords, who are the nobility. The room is a big and long square, as good as it can be... on the top rests the king’s couch and on the sides are seats for his appointees... The nobility of each state and the members of the house each sit in their own spot to discuss governmental affairs.

Although the two writers come from different socioeconomic classes, both seem to be similarly interested in the social patterns of space division in Westminster.

Mirza Saleh, who mentions symmetry and centrality more than 10 times in his very short essay on travels in Iran, does not discuss symmetry more than once in his travel to Europe. On that single occasion, where he talks about the location of the king’s room in the center of the Winter Palace in Saint Petersburg, centrality is tied to power. There, he also
mentions that the king’s palace is in the middle of the city and located on its highest part (Shirazi, 1985, p. 111). Associating verticality with social class Mirza Saleh (1985, p. 264 and similarly in p. 314) contends,

London’s houses are mostly six or seven stories, never less than five... In every house, the first floor is the kitchen, the second is the dining room, the third and sometimes the fourth is the living room, and the sixth seventh and eight floors are dedicated to the servant’s living rooms and all the bedrooms.

Unlike Mirza Saleh and Aminoddowleh who sought hegemony in symmetrical layout, Rezaqoli’s (1994, pp. 338, 358) few mentions on symmetry amount to his appreciation of order. In some instances the travelers misperceive a space as symmetrical or at the center while it is not the case. But even when they are correct, which in most cases of high architecture of Europe at the time is true, they tend to correlate centrality and hierarchy with a utopian image of progress.

Symmetry and centrality, in the traditional architecture of Iran are present in the visual features of space. By formal symmetry I am suggesting that while the spatial configuration of a building may remain asymmetrical, its elevation maintains a precise symmetry. This symmetrical pattern, which symbolizes perfection, becomes a criteria sought in the intended self (Farangestan) to approve the accepted values of the existing self. Other values may perceptively function in a reverse direction. For example magnitude and firmness are desired values that radiate from the imagined self and are projected on the Farangí Other. Yet, what all these values have in common is that they serve as familiar categories to domesticate the unfamiliar.

LIGHT UPON LIGHT

We drove the whole night until dawn. The abundance of lights and fixtures in roads and cities made them bright as day. No sign of darkness did we see. Looking over the street, the houses were lit and their reflection through the glass windows made the paths bright as daytime (Rezaqoli, 1994, p. 335).
Through the previous sentences, Rezaqoli is communicating his amazement when, for the first time, he is seeing Farangi cities on his way to London. Rezaqoli’s astonishment in lights on this road trip does not fade away at his first destination. At Bath, Rezaqoli (1839, p. 256) who was “overcome with astonishment” and “scarcely knew in what direction to bestow his attention” says,

at the entrance of each house, a wooden post was erected holding lantern [trying to write ‘lanterns’ with Persian script], which burnt all night till dawn like streetlights. Their reflections in the windows dazzles every being (Rezaqoli, 1994, p. 339).

The travelers become so amazed by the magic of light as if they prefer not to ruin its charm by learning its technology. Reporting on an opera house, Rezaqoli writes,

before every box [partitioned balconies] there are forty chandeliers of cut glass, each has fifty lights; there are also lights in every part of this house. The forty chandeliers of cut glass, each containing forty lights, and each light of five branches, as well as the other lights, have one pipe which, by touching an instrument, all the thousands of lights suddenly become dim, so that you scarcely see anything; and by moving the instrument differently, they as suddenly give a powerful light (Rezaqoli, 1839, p. 272).

Interestingly, Rezaqoli has not seen any of what he explains with so much detail above. He is actually reporting on Vali’s observations, which endorses the appeal of gas light to both brothers. Mentions of light decrease in the diary after Rezaqoli (1994, pp. 372, 562) learns about gas and its infrastructure and the magical charm demystifies.

I observe also along the road to London, neat pillars, fixed on both sides of the road, supporting fine lanterns. Whether it is raining or not, these lanterns are lit, burning all night long. This light is not of oil, or any other liquid, but the extraordinary production which they call gas, a description of which I will give hereafter. This, which is the spirit of coal,
is conducted through pipes, in the same way to every place. Thus the whole empire at night is as brilliant as day-time (Rezaqoli, 1839, p. 279).

This attention towards light is seen in all the travel accounts, often provoking a sensational description at the beginning and developing into an appreciation of its technological advancement. Among many technological accomplishments that amaze Aminoddowleh, such as the train, the steamships, and telegraph, one which seems not quite relevant to the rest, is in fact of architectural importance. Streetlights for Aminoddowleh (1994, p. 188) are a miracle that can happen only with the wisdom, wealth, and power of King Solomon:

King Solomon asked God to grant him a kingship never attained by anyone else... God has blessed the kings of Farangestan with enough power that each have a miraculous power for themselves. First, those steam ships and second the train... Also the telegraph which can bring news from hundreds and thousands of miles away; it is truly an example of t’ai al-ardh [traversing the earth miraculously without moving]. And, the gas light, moves fire like water and reflects it on the sky, or is used on the ground, they have the power to decide. But the flow is a thousand times smoother than water. Thousands and thousands of lanterns are lit in the city and make the earth like a sky full of stars. These are all signs of God’s power that is granted to humans.

Even though Aminoddowleh is known to bring the telegraph to Iran, he was equally if not more astonished by streetlights. In fact, after Gardens, the most reoccurring spatial discussion in Aminoddowleh’s memoir is about light. Despite the importance of light in the Islamic culture, it seems the major reason for Aminoddowleh’s attention to lighting is that he has never experienced anything similar in his life. Therefore, as the memoirs progress, the travelers turn their attention towards light displays and fireworks on special occasions.

Aminoddowleh’s first detailed mention of streetlights is on the fourth day of his arrival to France. On the way to Paris, the crew stops at Lyon, and before anything, it is the street lamps that catch their
attention (see Figure 39). Later when Aminoddowleh (1994, p. 183) writes about Lyon he makes sure to mention street lights right after a general description of the city’s population and facilities.

Figure 39. Lyon river view around 1860. Drawing by Rouargue, engraving by Willmann.

The idea of streetlights is so astonishing to Aminoddowleh that not only his first sentence about Paris starts with lighting but he is also concerned that he cannot communicate what he has observed through language:

Two hours past midnight of Monday January 19th [1857], we entered the heavenly city of Paris. Seeing Paris at night, with the abundance of orderly rows of lantern lights along the streets and in the buildings and shops, even if I try to exaggerate it, [my words] will not even be equal to one out of a thousand [lights] (Aminoddowleh, 1994, p. 190).

Since the contemporary audience of his memoir does not share a similar experience, Aminoddowleh (1994, pp. 208, 188, 235) uses metaphoric signifiers such as “moons” and “stars” or comparison with “daylight” to convey his ideas. These elements derived from Persian literature may
produce an image in the readers’ mind that associates more with an imaginative and poetic utopia rather than what the author has actually observed.

The appreciation that light receives in the travel writings is in part due to its symbolic value in Persian poetry, Sufi spirituality, and Islamic ideology. Al-Nur, The Light, is one of God’s names in Islam and also a name of a chapter in the Qur’an. Allah, according to this chapter, “is the Light; of the heavens and the earth; The parable of His Light is as if there were a niche; And within it a Lamp: The Lamp enclosed in Glass; The glass as it were a brilliant star; Lit from a blessed Tree; An Olive, neither of the East nor of the West; Whose oil is well-nigh luminous, though fire scarce touched it; Light upon Light” (Surah 24:35 Al Nur, 2996-3002).

This desire for light is later institutionalized by the first parliament of Mashruteh through the municipal governance law, known as Ghanun-e Baladiyeh. The fourth article of this law, passed in June 1907, puts the municipality in charge of “providing city light” (Tavakoli-Targhi, 2009, p. 451).

Many important urban patterns, such as the street layout, vertical zoning of activities in the space, different urban functions, and urban furniture would not have even been introduced if it was not for the travelers’ fascination with streetlights:

And this street [Champs-Élysées, see Figure 40] has different layouts. The first is that around the two parts designated for pedestrians there are two rows of nice trees, and in between them, are elaborated cast iron columns with big lanterns suspended from them. At night, in this 8 mile street, two rows of lanterns glow like two orderly chains of fire. Dominating the lanterns, are thousands and thousands and millions and millions of chandeliers, panjshakhe-ha [a certain pendant lamp with five sections], wall lamps, and colored lamps situated on windows and chambers of buildings on the side of the street. The first floors of all the buildings are stores and shops… [that] have a minimum
of thirty to forty lamps each. Big stores, hotels, cafés, and theatres have one thousand to two thousand lighting fixtures. And above their entrances the name of the buildings and their owners are printed with fire... Ten to twelve thousand carriages are constantly traversing in the street, each with two lanterns in the front. (Aminoddowleh, 1994, p. 193)

Figure 40. "The Milliner on the Champs Elysées" by Jean Béraud in the 1880s.

SPACE THAT BELONGS TO NOBODY

Among the urban patterns that the travelers indirectly introduce, one that is closely tied with the idea of streetlights has a major significance: the public realm, particularly at night. “The boulevard street [Boulevard Des Italiens, see Figure 41 and Figure 42],” Aminoddowleh (1994, p. 215) contends,

is a famous street in Paris and is over 3 miles long. In all nights of the year, it is a public tafarrojgah [place of excursion]. On both sides are five and six story buildings full of light... even Paris resident are amazed by the events that
happens every night [on this street]. Because most of the theaters, cafés, and hotels are located on this street.... On this street about 20 to 30 big and famous cafés exist including Café de Paris.

Figure 41. Boulevard Des Italiens, Paris. Engraved by J. Schroeder, 1853.

Figure 42. Boulevard Des Italiens, Maison Dorée, Paris. Original miniature on steel drawn by Arnoux, engraved by Wilmann. ca 1860.
While the travelers seem quite confused by the idea of urban spaces that are accessible to the public, they get to educate themselves through their travels. The process of understanding public space becomes clear in the progression of their writings. Their first encounters with public space are characterized by astonishment. Mirza Saleh first experiences public space in Saint Petersburg, where he is astonished to see almost twenty thousand people enjoying themselves in one “garden.” “The House of the People” as he suggests, was one of Peter the Great’s ideas to encourage people to gather and mingle with each other. He built a house so people could gather, some would read books, some would play chess, and others would perform different amusement activities. Every day, people spend 5 hours at the house of the people (Shirazi, 1985, p. 113).

While waiting in his hotel in Bath, Rezaqoli (1994, p. 371), writes about the places that his brother Vâli visits in London, the first being one “that belongs to nobody.” Most probably referring to a park, Rezaqoli shows how naïve his initial judgment of public space is. When he later talks about a public gallery, Rezaqoli (1994, p. 488) says the place is “a waqf (religious endowment) to the public.” Using the word waqf, Rezaqoli attempts to define public space through the closest concept in Islamic law. Later in his writing, Rezaqoli (1994, p. 539) shows a more complex understanding of the concept of public: “the state belongs to the public. Naturally, the public participation in government brings about strength and prosperity, because when everyone holds a share, no one will lose sight of their collective benefit.”

Whatever their theoretical understanding of public was, the brothers definitely took delight in the public life of modern streets. “The drive through the crowded streets which lead to London bridge,” Fraser (1973, p. 163) writes,

was, of itself, always a treat to them. ‘For my part,’ said the prince, more than once as we drove along, ‘I think the streets and the shops are themselves about the best shows in London: what riches, what an endless variety of goods! One cannot tire of them’… At night, in going out or returning from parties, they
were never tired of looking down the long lines of the streets that they passed.

Similar to Rezaqoli, Aminoddowleh’s understanding of public sphere developed during his trip. He also described public realm with the closest concepts in Iranian culture such as eyds [Iranian and Islamic feasts] and mourning rituals. Describing the welcoming party held for Tsar’s brother, Aminoddowleh (1994, p. 282) states, “the city of Paris during his stay, was decorated like eyd. Stores, shops, and the bazaar were decorated, the city lights were increased, and the night was illuminated. Parties and dances were held in all streets and neighborhoods.”

The travelers gradually start discussing public space in terms of its functions. Some are ceremonial, like Aminoddowleh’s (1994, p. 214) description of the Bœuf Gras carnivals and Mirza Saleh (1985, p. 292) and Rezaqoli’s (Rezaqoli, 1839, p. 408) descriptions of the fireworks at Vauxhall Gardens (see Figure 6), some have specific functions like tea gardens (Shirazi, 1985, p. 293), while others are multifunctional:

In the neighborhoods, they have multiple gardens which they call a ‘square.’ Each is a square area like a courtyard… The neighbors each pay an annual fee to the gardener to maintain the garden… London’s air stays purified because of this, it also serves as an ornament to the city, and people can enjoy their time strolling in the gardens (Shirazi, 1985, p. 285).

Through their journey, the travelers gradually redefine their understanding of “public.” Mentions of the words ‘am and ‘omum (the public) are not very frequent and begin rather late in the travels. Mirza Saleh (1985, pp. 280, also see 336) informs his audience that the word “park” is a bagh (garden) but for the ‘am, the public. Explaining the concept of a park (or a zoo) in Brussels Aminoddowleh (1994, p. 302) introduces the idea of “public” into discussion:

They have organized these spaces to be a place of leisure for the visitors and the entire nation. Especially in this garden of Brussels, a public ceremony is held on Saturday evenings and a
group gathers to play music and people socialize and enjoy. It is a wonderful place to visit.

The transformation of modern public space in Iran shows a similar trajectory. In other words, as through the travelers’ experiences, the concept gained more clarity, its actual formation and development in Iran’s history of urban form had also undergone an evolutionary process. The closest concept to public parks in premodern Iran had been large private gardens that were open to the public in certain days and out of the courtesy of their wealthy owners. An example is the Lala garden in Yazd. Famed for its flowers and fruits, the garden was accessible to the public during the weekends; “it was almost a public park,” as one historian notes (Ayati, 1938, p. 223).

Some of these private gardens gained particular features, similar to the functions that the travelers witnessed in many Farangi parks. Sabat Garden in Yazd, as an example, “had a field for lions and wild cows in its front, where Shah Yahya would sit and watch their battle. Part of the garden was dedicated to wildlife, a small zoo for the benefit of people with sections for public enjoyment” (Ayati, 1938, p. 225). The later more modern public parks were mostly located on large private gardens that the state had obtained.

ARCHITECTURE AND URBAN INSTITUTIONS

While some travelers, such as Mirza Saleh, were eager to learn more about the institutional substructures in Farangestan, others like Aminoddowleh were more attracted to its manifestations. For example, when Mirza Saleh (1985, pp. 80-48, 110-113, 117-119, 146, 268-270, 278, 289, 290, 322, 329) describes Moscow State University, the Imperial Hermitage Museum at Saint Petersburg, Westminster House of Lords, Chelsea Royal Hospital, College Asylum, or prisons, press houses, and libraries, the architectural setting serves as a context to discuss the institutional foundations. Aminoddowleh had greater opportunities to learn more about the formation of institutions related to space design and management, especially in his multiple discussion with Georges-Eugène Haussmann (Aminoddowleh, 1994, p. 205). His memoir,
nevertheless, shows a limited understanding of the underlying intellectual foundation of spatial institutions. While participating in a city council discussion during his stay in London, Aminoddowleh seems oblivious about what is being discussed, partly perhaps due to his lack of proficiency of the English language. Hence, he merely describes the building. Mirza Saleh (1985, pp. 178, 181, 266, 339) and Rezaqoli (1994, p. 539), in contrast, provide fair explanations about the city council, municipality, and city officials in charge of urban management.

ARCHITECTURE AND URBAN SERVICES AND FACILITIES

The construction process of public roads in England is worth mentioning. Road constructions in England began in 1663. The approach was to appoint a person at 5 to 10 mile intervals to collect money from the people who pass through. People riding on horses pay 3 pennies while coaches pay six pennies or more. The collected money is spent on further road construction. There are people assigned to constantly clean and repair the roads (Shirazi, 1985, p. 308).

The idea of mutual responsibilities between the public nation and the state as well as its manifestation in spatial planning is present in the travelers’ memoirs. The state’s role in constructing large scale projects and providing basic infrastructure is also recognized by the travelers. While reporting on Napoleon III’s speech in the inauguration ceremony of the parliament, Aminoddowleh (1994, p. 380) mentions many urban projects conducted through state authority, including renovation of hospitals in Vincennes, the development plan of Lyon, various street designs, and restoration of historic cathedrals.

References to urban services were usually focused on their visible aspects, leaving the descriptions of the underlying infrastructure to a more general speculation. In England, Rezaqoli (1994, p. 575) explains, the flowing water is not exposed in streets and apartments, rather in every house multiple faucets exist that, once opened, you can get as much water as needed. In most rooms, a faucet is
embedded, so there is no need to go outside to get drinking and washing water. They have also taken measures to elevate water from beneath, so that the upper stories of each house get easy access to water. Since, most houses are built of wood, fire is frequent. Once it occurs, they remove a stone on the wall, and attach a leather pipe to it, that can shoot water three hundred zar’ into the air. In less than 10 minutes the house is full of water and the fire is out. Beneath all buildings in London rests such a pipe.

Two decades before Rezaqoli’s remark, Mirza Saleh (Shirazi, 1985, p. 314) also observes, that “every Kitchen in the English house has a faucet that constantly brings water from outside.” To dispose of the sewage, Mirza Saleh (1985, p. 261) explains elsewhere,

in every street, they have dug a big path under the ground, its width is approximately two zar’. Every street has multiple slopes which direct rain water and sewage. In every house the waste water is directed to the path where it heads towards the Thames and eventually to the sea.

Similar to Mirza Saleh, Rezaqoli (1994, p. 246) shows interest in the sewage system in Damascus, particularly because it keeps the streets clean. Previously, I have discussed the importance of cleanliness (see page 104), especially when it comes to streets (see page 79). Quite understandably, at his first stop in England, Rezaqoli (1839, p. 259) outlines a detailed report on the street cleaning system of Bath:

we saw a horse drawing a sort of carriage on which there was a large wooden barrel, which might contain about 2000 manns (a Persian weight) of water. Attached to this barrel there was a hollow tube pierced with small holes, through which the water pours out, and by this means all the street was sprinkled with water in a second, which a hundred carriers of water could not do in five hours. After this, another cart came and swept all the dirt and carried it away. In a minute all the street became as clean as looking-glass.
While visiting the Thames tunnel (see Figure 43), which according to Aminoddowleh was among the best structures in the world [the others being together the Crystal Palace, a steamship, and Menai Suspension Bridge], he seems equally fascinated by the sweeping of the area. All three travelers, Mirza Saleh, Rezaqoli (1994, p. 411), and Aminoddowleh (1994, p. 257) show particular interest in the toll collected at the Thames tunnel and how the sums were designated to provide security and future repairs.

![Figure 43. Interior of the Thames Foot Tunnel, mid-19th century](image.png)

Besides water distribution systems (Rezaqoli, 1994, p. 575; Shirazi, 1985, p. 283), toll collections, road signs (Aminoddowleh, 1994, p. 186; Rezaqoli, 1994, p. 372; Shirazi, 1985, p. 263), and street sweeping (Aminoddowleh, 1994, p. 257; Rezaqoli, 1994, p. 571; Shirazi, 1985, p. 116), another urban facility/service that amazed all the travelers was the natural gas processing and distribution for streetlights (Aminoddowleh, 1994, pp. 183, 193; Rezaqoli, 1994, pp. 372, 563; Shirazi, 1985, p. 263). Mentions of urban services also include garbage disposal (Rezaqoli, 1994, p. 571), firefighters
Architecture facilities also received attention from the travelers. In addition to facilities such as water and waste circulation in residences, the travelers specifically mention central heating systems and chimneys (Rezaqoli, 1994, p. 576). Residing in a hotel at Bonn, Rezaqoli (1994, p. 607) writes:

A new thing that we had not seen elsewhere was iron ovens that were placed in each room of the hotel, as a substitute to fireplaces. Embedded in the wall, is a pipe that connected this panel to an oven located outside the building. With very little coal, the panel fully heats the room in 30 minutes without letting any smoke in the room. Indeed, a very beneficial technology it was.

THE FALLING HAT OF WISDOM

Previously, on page 62, I discussed the travelers’ approach to tracking records. I argued that the abundance of superlative adjectives in their writing was in part an attempt to record the wonderments of Farangestan. Among the adjectives, the ones relating to the magnitude of a building are especially frequent in the diaries. The words connoting largeness are quite diverse in the travelers’ writings, for example Rezaqoli Mirza (1994, p. 633) uses ‘azim, rafi’, and vasi’, which respectively mean large, high, and wide to describe Melk abbey in Austria (see Figure 44).
Mirza Saleh glorifies the large church spire at Salisbury Cathedral (1985, p. 178) (see Figure 21) as well as a large naval hospital at Plymouth (Devonport) (1985, p. 187). Rezaqoli (1994, pp. 422, 427, 450, 493, 505, 616, 623, 624) similarly praises a great number of architectural typologies, such as castles, factories, hotels, offices, museums, bridge and squares, for the largeness. All travelers specifically mention the number of floor in multistory buildings. Rezaqoli (1994, pp. 338, 517, 614), for example, in separate instances communicates that residential apartments in Bath, London, and Frankfurt are 4-5 stories high.

But aside from their fascination with largeness, the travelers evaluated the quality of architecture based on its size. For the travelers, a normative value was hidden in the grandiosity of a
structure, as if a building that lacks this feature “is not worth attention” (1994, p. 307). This phrase was used by Aminoddowleh when describing an arsenal in Antwerp, Belgium, that to his disappointment “didn’t have much magnitude.” The impression that large structures had on the travelers is also evident when Fraser is trying to report what the travelers had told him about their visit to Cádiz. “The only remark I remember hearing from them,” Fraser recalls, “was respecting the size and magnificence of the cathedral, which appeared to have made a considerable impression of the mind of Timour Meerza [Teymur Mirza].” If the same remark had similarly caught the attention of the Iranian audience of the travel accounts, then their imagination of Farangestan was further romanticized with wondrously gigantic structures.

The use of exaggerative narrations and metaphoric language when describing the magnitude of buildings confirms the appreciation of largeness in the travelers’ subconscious. Rezaqoli, for examples, quotes the prince of Austria in his visit to Windsor who says: “you have seen nothing yet. I have been in this country for 10 years and have visited this garden with the Queen, yet I have not seen a third of this castle” (1994, p. 428). As another example, Aminoddowleh (1994, p. 286) glorifies École Militaire as “an excellent and magnificent building, which sat like a mountain on the southern side of the square.” Or when talking about the temples in Acropolis, Aminoddowleh (1994, p. 158) explains, “I saw four magnificent buildings on a wide plane. Their height knocks off the hat of wisdom from one’s head and the firmness of these sky-scraping buildings shakes one’s wisdom.”

The appreciation of magnitude can also be seen in Aminoddowleh’s use of the concept in relation to other adjectives. For instance, the association of perfection with largeness is implied when Aminoddowleh (1994, p. 166) praises the ancient remains of Pompeii (see Figure 45) as “perfect buildings, big churches and theatres, and two big squares.”
Figure 45. The ruins of Pompeii, Italy, the Roman city damaged by earthquake and then overwhelmed by lava and ash from an eruption of the volcano Mount Vesuvius in the first century. Photograph 1850s

FROM ADOBE TO GRANITE

All round the outside of the [Academy] palace [see Figure 46] there is a balustrade of guilt iron bars three pikes long, and all its walls are built of beautiful marble [so polished that one could see the reflection of his own eye lashes in it]. The furniture is of mosaic work, made of sandal wood and mahogany... The walls are constructed of marble of different colours, and between each stone is a line of gold... The interior walls are all covered with rich velvet, each room with a different colour. The chairs about different part of the palace are of gold and silver... We observed in one of the rooms a splendid specimen of a valuable stone, standing on a mineral pillar, the whole highly wrought like glass... We saw also another vase of a mineral substance, of a beautiful emerald colour... Besides all this, there are numerous and most superb and unrivalled pillars [of white marble] (Rezagoli, 1839, pp. 174-175).
Tectonics may not have been discussed by the travelers as the relation between construction material and structure; nevertheless, as a framework, it helps to understand how they perceived ideas of materiality and stability.

Certain materials, for the travelers, have an essential value, regardless of their purpose. Discussions of how materiality can affect architectural quality or respond to environmental and functional requirements, although rare, can be traced in the diaries. Mirza Saleh, for example, mentions that a library in Moscow had a room totally made of iron to protect the books from fire. Or in another instance he explains that the use of stone and brick in Saint Petersburg and London was to avoid the spread of possible fire (Shirazi, 1985, pp. 110, 262). Rezaqoli (1994, pp. 411, 502), similarly, when explaining the Thames tunnel and man-made shipyard channels on the banks of the Thames, he mentions that the use of mortar was because of its resistance to water.

For the travelers, materiality also possessed a self and other dimension. Mirza Saleh (1985, p. 62), while describing Tbilisi, contends, “its houses, whatever was built in the past, was from stone
and bricks with a flat roof, and whatever was built in the last 15 years has a Russian [Farangi] approach so the rooms are built out of wood and glass.” The duality of self and other, in architectural material, corresponds with the imagined values of material, rather than its relation with structure, function, and climate. Low value material such as mud, adobe, and bricks are often associated with Iran’s architecture. In the travel accounts, when descriptions of architecture become so detailed to include materiality, it is often the conventionally celebrated material such as gold, silver, and marble that are mentioned (Rezaqoli, 1994, pp. 423, 424, 543, 600, 601, 616, 624). It is quite understandable that the travelers describe what fascinated them about certain building materials, especially since they were quite often exposed to luxury houses, castles, and palaces. Nevertheless, for the readers, this constant repetition of such material in the travel accounts strengthens their image of a Farangi utopia, a wonderland built out of gold and silver.

Unlike other travelers, who seldom discuss materiality, Mirza Saleh’s discussions of architecture are mostly through talking about the construction material. Although both in his travels in Iran and to Europe, he constantly mentions materiality, it is not just any building material that would catch his eyes; some seem to have an inherent value for Mirza Saleh. Marble, mirror, lapis lazuli, gold, and silver are the only material that Mirza Saleh (1985, pp. 11-13, 19, 24, 29-32) mentions in his travels through Iran. This pattern totally changes in his trip to England. The valued material becomes stone. In Bath, Mirza Saleh (1985, pp. 336, 337) notes, that “all the houses are built from stone, with extreme beauty and elegance... The whole city is built out of white stone. The stone is so soft that, like wood, they can carve any shape out of it with a chisel.” The value of stone to Mirza Saleh, as well as his keen observation of architectural materials, becomes more evident when he informs the reader how stone appearance is faked in Saint Petersburg. The walls of the houses, Mirza Saleh explains, (1985, p. 115) “are made of brick with a stucco plaster on top of it, which is formed like stone and foreigners will assume the whole wall is built out of stone.”
Rezaqoli, who during his travel learns to appreciate the value of modern material such as iron and glass (1994, pp. 216, 373, 454, 515, 576, 625), is also obsessed with the idea that stone, and particularly granite, has an inherent value. His constant mentions of granite (1994, pp. 242, 266, 303, 306, 307, 311, 316, 338) are often not to realistically describe materiality, but to project the metaphorical value of granite, as a symbol of firmness in classic Persian literature, onto the praised structure.

Using a similarly metaphorical tone, Aminoddowleh (1994, p. 163) suggests, “the buildings [in the Acropolis complex] were generally built with huge rocks connected with iron joints. Much effort has been put on their strength and stability, where even imagination cannot breach it.” To unravel this mysterious appraisal of stone that repeats itself across multiple decades, another quotation from Aminoddowleh is enlightening. According to Aminoddowleh (1994, p. 158), the firmness of the temples of Acropolis “shakes one’s wisdom. Apparently, buildings that last for three millennia are themselves evidence of their firmness.”

**NAILS ON STONE**

The granite barricade surrounding the city [Gibraltar] was 4 zar’ in thickness, so firm that not an ant could pass through (Rezaqoli, 1994, p. 316).

The value that the travelers seek through stone is what Vitruvius (1960) asserts as one of the three qualities a structure should possess, *firmitas*. This appreciation of firmness sheds light to Aminoddowleh’s poetic admiration of firm buildings and Rezaqoli’s appreciation of granite. In fact, in many instances that Rezaqoli mentions granite he immediately uses concept that signify firmness (Rezaqoli, 1994, pp. 306, 311, 315), which are understandably quite diverse in his writings, examples include *mohkam, mostahkam, estehkam, hesanat*, and *ghavi*. This tectonic relationship between granite and firmness is reaffirmed in the early stages of Rezaqoli’s journey, where Rezaqoli had witnessed how a torrential rain had destroyed most houses.
in Damascus, except the ones built with granite (Rezaqoli, 1994, p. 242).

The travelers’ judgment of firmness comes, however, from their immanent perceptions. It is the “visual” firmness that they can relate to: the heavier the building “appears” the more attention it receives. Structural stability when it is not exposed with visual strength, in cases such as buildings with relatively thin cast iron columns, is less discussed by the travelers. The perception of firmness for Aminoddowleh appears primarily in thickness of architectural elements, most importantly the columns and walls. Describing Château de Coucy (see Figure 47), which was destroyed in 1917, Aminoddowleh (1994, p. 273) contends,

It is extremely rigid and stable and strong, all the walls as well as its tower are of stone. The wall is about 10 meters thick. Within the castle there is a single tower that is very high and very big. Its height is about 40 meters and it covers an area of 25 by 25 meters, all is stone.

Figure 47. Château of Coucy, 1860
Firmness, as in the case of magnitude, is not a simple descriptive adjective for the travelers; it holds a normative value. The normative attachment to firmness is evident in Rezaqoli’s writing, in which the word firmness is often followed with a complimentary adjective, such as 'ali, perfect (Rezaqoli, 1994, pp. 246, 284, 318, 337, 469, 486). Even in Mirza Saleh’s (1985, pp. 78, 109) writing, the mentions of stonework are usually more detailed in buildings that value firmness most, such as forts and castles. He also, on many occasions, shows fascination in the very big blocks of stone. Aminoddowleh, when returning from his second trip to Britain, gives a summary of the progress that he sees in the UK and somehow connects it with stone buildings. Regardless of his logic, Aminoddowleh sees a similar cause for all the esterahat (amenities) that the British people have and stone buildings: trust in rationality. “All the secular affairs of the British people,” Aminoddowleh (1994, p. 372) suggests, should be analyzed based on this. Today, none of the European States have the great prosperity, rich market, and strong government as in England. All the buildings that I observed were like iron nails on stone. The nation and the state are free from seeking leisure and their concentration is on development. Their ornaments are simple and they have good buildings and fine affairs... All the buildings that they erect are built as strong as possible... The difference between the British State and other States is that although all have developed many cities, the British State builds its cities only with stone and iron and without any masonry. But other states are stuck in the second and third level [emphasis added].

Interestingly, when it comes to discussing the progress of a country, Aminoddowleh starts with giving architectural examples. Even more interesting is that for Aminoddowleh firmness seems to be the ultimate value to measure the success and rationality of a building. Thus, masonry, as the basic tectonic in Persian architecture, in this statement is somehow associated with backwardness. The alternative to this backwardness emerges from Aminoddowleh’s ideal quality of a
building, i.e. firmness, which he seeks through, and projects on, the stone and steel buildings of Britain.

COLUMNLESS STRUCTURES

Figure 48. Interior of King's College Chapel, Cambridge, engraved by Henry Le Keux, 1812

I saw a church called King’s [College] Chapel [see Figure 48]. The church has absolutely no columns.

For some travelers, every peculiar dream seemed so achievable in Farangestan that they, in many cases, refused to seek a logical explanation. Also, observing technological advancements such as telegraph and balloons had raised their expectations so high that seeing a column-less space would not even attract attention.

Among the travelers, Mirza Saleh, only in few instances, discusses structure. He was mostly interested in the span of arches and the
distance between columns. Mirza Saleh (1985, p. 78) mentions a very large room in Kremlin, Moscow, which was covered by an arch, but used a column in the middle to support the load. The Westminster hall (see Figure 49), in contrast, did not have a supporting column and thus raised his curiosity. London’s court of justice, Mirza Saleh (1985, p. 268) describes, “was a huge room called Westminster hall. Its length was 91 zar’, its width was 25 zar’, and its height was 31 zar’. The roof was built peculiarly, and had no column to hold it in the middle.”

Figure 49. Westminster Hall in the Palace of Westminster, London, in the early 19th century
In London, Mirza Saleh, explaining the different architectural typologies, dedicates a section to bridges. While describing different bridges on the Thames, such as Southwark Bridge, Black Friars Bridge, Westminster Bridge, and Vauxhall Bridge, Mirza Saleh (1985, p. 283) makes sure to communicate the length of the bridge, the number of arches, and span they cover:

The construction of Southwark bridge [Figure 50] started when I arrived in London. Today it is finished and used by the public. The bridge is built from iron and has no more than three arches. The middle arch, which is said to be the biggest in the world, covers 70 zar'.

![Southwark Iron Bridge](image)

Figure 50. Southwark Iron Bridge, as seen from Bank-side, by Sutherland, T., 1818
20 years later, Rezaqoli (1994, p. 515) is amazed by a more advanced bridge on the Thames: “one which is of iron. Not a tiny bit of stone, stucco, or wood is used in the bridge. It is all made from iron sheets and chains which are connected by iron joints.”

CONSTRUCTING THE MAGICAL

There is an instrument for looking at and searching the bottom of the sea. This instrument is a kind of bell of crystal, which the water cannot penetrate, nor can air. To this bell, there is a hollowed instrument like a probe, fixed like a pipe of leather, which conducts the air down to it. This apparatus is a box of glass and a man might enter it, and be shut up and thrown into the sea, to the bottom of which it might go. Thus the diver goes to the bottom of the sea, and whenever he finds his air exhausted, he has only to touch this pipe, which would convey a most pleasant breath into his heart (Rezaqoli, 1839).

When confronted with instruments and technologies that raised the travelers’ curiosity, such as diving bells, balloons, gas lights, and wool and linen manufacturing, they generously, yet often amateurly, detailed the operating and construction specifics. Discussions of architectural details, however, remain quite rare, possibly because the travelers assumed more familiarity with the subject. Naturally, descriptions of architectural construction are provided in cases that the travelers found captivating.

“It is a peculiar bridge” Aminoddowleh (1994, p. 351) explains, “they melt iron and mold it as boards, specific to the bridge, all in a single size and width. The boards are joined with iron pins, in a width of 6 meters and the length of 800 steps. On both sides netted me’jars (balusters) are provided.”
As apparent in Aminoddowleh’s description of Menai suspension bridge (see Figure 51), amongst the architectural advancements of the time, iron and steel bridges were the travelers’ favorites. Three decades before Aminoddowleh’s trip to England, Rezaqoli (1994, pp. 397, 416, 515) dedicated three detailed descriptions of bridge engineering in his travel account (see page 140).

The case of describing construction details is quite different with Mirza Saleh. Not in that he disliked discussing objects and spaces that had a repulsing feature, but in his ability to recognize such captivating qualities in less revealing structures. For example, amazed by the obelisk at the Hippodrome of Constantinople in Istanbul (see Figure 52), Mirza Saleh, like an astute structural engineer who is familiar with Domenico Fontana’s proposal for erecting the obelisk (see Figure 53), is disappointed that no one can “explain how and with what details it was framed and erected” (1985, p. 374).
Figure 52. A photograph showing Obelisk of Theodosius attributed to Francis Frith and Frank M. Good, 1850s to 1870s

Figure 53. The choreography of moving the Vatican obelisk in Domenico Fontana's 1590 manuscript Della Trasportazione dell'Obelisco Vaticano
ORNAMENTALIZING THE OCCIDENT

In the previously mentioned passage by Aminoddowleh, where he proposes that England’s progress is an outcome of the “trust in rationality,” he gives a rather interesting example. “The nation and the state,” he suggests, “are free from seeking leisure and their concentration is on development. Their ornaments are simple and they have good buildings and fine affairs” (1994, p. 372). The adjective simple for ornament gains a normative value similar to good for buildings and fine for affairs. While ornament had been a sign for richness and value in both Iran and 19th-century Europe, and while it had been commonly associated with high social classes, where Aminoddowleh was closely tied to, he formulates ornamentation with an unprecedented theory. Ornament for Aminoddowleh, had become a sign of deviation from rationality to wasteful indolence and leisure. Almost half a century later, the same argument shaped the discourse against architectural ornament in modernist writings (Loos, 1998; Sullivan, 1922).

The other travelers although may not have articulated the same avant garde perspective, yet somewhat shared Aminoddowleh’s theory about architectural ornament. Mirza Saleh (1985, pp. 10-14, 30), in his short travel writing on Iran, mentions many of the ornamental elements he sees in Isfahan and Tehran as signs of their architectural value. Examples include, the tile works at the tomb of Shater Davani, mirror work and mosaics, calligraphy, painting, stone works, wood carving, at Saadabad Garden also known as the Mirror Palace, Marble stone work and ceramic work at Shah School (see Figure 54), mirror work on the ceiling and wall paintings in the shelves of Talar-e tavileh, cloisonné and ceiling painting in Chehel Sotun, wall paintings in Aliqapu (see Figure 55), monabbatkari (wood carving), minakari (Vitreous enamel), paintings, and sculptures in divankhaneh (Golestana Palace).
Figure 54. Tile works at Shah School, Courtesy of Mr. Farid Attar

Figure 55. Wall painting in Aliqapu
Nevertheless, in Farangestan, his mentions of ornament and decoration are reduced to stone works in the Winter Palace, Saint Petersburg, mosaic works at Westminster Cathedral, London (Figure 56), and stain glasses in Exeter Cathedral, Exeter (Figure 57): “On the east and west side of the cathedral’s arch, they have built two big windows, painted on the glass, and baked, which looks similar to minakari. I have never seen a painting so beautiful” (Shirazi, 1985, p. 180).

Figure 56. A side-chapel roof mosaic in Westminster Cathedral, London
Not that architectural ornaments do not exist in the buildings that Mirza Saleh visits, but it seems that his appreciation of decoration and ornament has faded along his trip. Yet, among all decorative arts, frescos seemed to have impressed Mirza Saleh the most. Representational paintings of living objects, as symbol of idolatry, were prohibited in the Islamic culture. Although rarely found in royal palaces, depiction of human figures, was not popular in Iran’s architecture. Mirza Saleh’s (1985, pp. 58, 78, 111, 272, 325) interest in fresco, which is evident in his reoccurring mentions religious painting in churches and ceiling paintings in palaces, may be rooted in his curiosity about the prohibited.

Describing St. Paul’s Cathedral in London, Rezagoli (1994, p. 357) states,
it is a magnificent building with moldings and carvings that dazzles the mind. And on top of the church, as well as all around it, numerous stone statues of people and bizarre animals and birds are engraved and carved.

What makes this description more interesting is that it was written before Rezaqoli visits London; he is in fact reporting on what he has heard from Vali. Rezaqoli and his brothers, who similarly show quite a bit of interest in depictions of human figures, were also deeply interested in woodcarving. As Fraser observes (1973, p. 189), on their way to Windsor Palace,

[they] stopped to examine the beautiful church, the exquisite carved wooden work of which excited much admiration. Indeed I have remarked in more than one occasion, that this sort of ornament has attracted more notice from them than work in richer materials.

Also, when visiting the cathedral at Brussels, “the whole party were delighted,” Fraser (1973, p. 12) notes, “the pulpit, a rare chef-d’oeuvre in carved wood, attracted great admiration. I have before observed that this style of ornament appears to suite their fancy. The beautiful painted windows too were much noticed.”

In the absence of figurative art in the Islamic regions at the time, nonrepresentational art had flourished in glassworks, ceramics, textiles, and most importantly, calligraphy. A particular observation by Rezaqoli about calligraphy shows a gradual shift in his understanding of decorative art; one that two decades later, in Aminoddowleh’s writing, would include architectural ornament. Almost six decades before architects such as Louis Sullivan (1922) and Adolf Loos (1998) theorized how ornaments, being functionless and serving no particular purpose, are unnecessary, immoral, and even criminal, Rezaqoli (1994, p. 530) states: “in England, everyone can write and read, however, they are not into calligraphy. They say the ability to apply reading and writing is sufficient and any attempt in the arts of handwriting is a waste of time and useless.”
**SPATIAL LACUNAE**

The content of the travelogues are important for this research not just because of what they report, but also for their intentional or unconscious omissions. The selectiveness either in the cognitive process or in the representation can shed light on the preferences and prejudices that shape the authors’ reading of the architectural phenomena that they describe.

Figure 58. London, Ludgate Hill viaduct, engraving by G. Doré 1870 (Benevolo, 1971, p. 143)

A serious void of a critical approach stands out in the enchanted encounters of the early travel writings in 19th-century Iran. Even Mirza Saleh, who tries to remain impartial in his memoir, is unable to see any imperfections in England. While in his writings in Iran, Mirza Saleh (1985, pp. 18, 20, 21, 25) complains about uneven and narrow roads and houses, mosques, and schools in ruin, and while he describes
Turkish cities as disorderly places full of uneducated people, filthy streets, and small old houses (Shirazi, 1985, pp. 418, 419), his admiration of England extends to its “perfect agriculture,” “most excellent horses,” and “wise people” (Shirazi, 1985, p. 309). This is the same person who had shown a very impartial approach in Moscow, where he explains that it has “buildings [that] lack order and symmetry. In a street, for example, two houses that are big and beautiful are next to five ugly ones... Some streets are wide, paved, and clean and others are narrow and filthy” (Shirazi, 1985, p. 78).

Rezaqoli Mirza shows a rather positive character; seldom does he complain about anything. He usually prefers to point out the positive aspects of the places he visits. Nevertheless, unlike the other Iranian travelers who visited Europe in early 19th century, Rezaqoli expresses a few critical opinions about the habits of people in England. The people, he claims,

insist on showing off their talents and skills. They seek fame and once someone acquires a minor accomplishment, he/she displays it in thousands of ways. Love of worldly affairs is over-
appreciated there and unlike the oriental, they are not hospitable to strangers (Rezaqoli, 1994, p. 527).

This approach becomes more dominant in the travel writings of the early 20th century, where it led to “a schizophrenic attitude towards Western civilisation, which divided it falsely into a set of practical values which were permissible and another of intellectual ones which were not” (el-Enany, 2006, p. 8). In other words, while the second generation of travelers appreciated science, technology, industry, and material amenities of Farangestan, they were critical towards its value systems.

Similar to the next generation of travelers, Rezaqoli is enchanted by the material manifestation of Farangi life in general and architectural and urban space in particular. Even in instances that he notices imperfections, Rezaqoli (1994, p. 513) considers them as signs of progress. London he contends “is so fully occupied and developed that sometimes the carriages are jammed which block the road and disrupt movement” (Rezaqoli, 1994, p. 372).

The paradise-like image of London that Rezaqoli renders in his writings is vastly different from how he really feels about the city. From Fraser (1973, p. 273), we learn that Rezaqoli and his brothers “were heartily sick of London... its noise, and its rattle, and its dust, and bad air.” As a person who disapproves of any complaints about the quality of water in London (1994, p. 671) and who states in his writing that “in London, there is absolutely no sign of smoke and steam” (1994, p. 576), Rezaqoli appears dramatically disapproving of the issue in his private discussions with Fraser: “who would live in London, with its dust, and its heat, and the eternal whirr! Birr! Jirr! Of its streets, with their thousand carts and carriages, and uproar”? “I am tired of this London, I can’t breathe in it, I am choked” (Fraser, 1973, pp. 176, 284). The reason for this contradictory attitude is definitely not that Rezaqoli refuses to include any negative comments in his writing. In fact on occasions, although rare, Rezaqoli shows that he can be quite harsh when it comes to criticism. Galatz, for example, he suggests, “is the most disgusting place in the world. The people are stuck in so much garbage, they cannot escape the abundance of filth. I
am astonished how they can live here; for it is the abode of hell” (Rezaqoli, 1994, p. 676). The reason that Rezaqoli deliberately conceals his feeling about London must thus be sought in his attempt to maintain the paradisiacal image of Farangestan that he paints for the audience.

Aminoddowleh also expresses almost no critical opinion about what he observes in his tour. Even behaviors that his culture disapproves are exceptionally acceptable in Farangestan. Aminoddowleh’s approval of dancing, for example, is not because he has reconsidered his values system, but rather because “Farangestan dance is not vulgar and obscene” (Aminoddowleh, 1994, p. 203). The same double standard is seen in his discussions of architecture. The absence of any mentions of overcrowded cities, noisy streets, and dense cities (see Figure 58), especially by a person acquainted with spacious and calm environments, should be taken with a grain of salt. This unconscious blindness goes to its extremes when visiting major industrial capitals such as Manchester and Lille (see Figure 59). As a high ranking official who visited these cities for a day or two, Aminoddowleh was probably not exposed to the appalling and unhealthy slums. Not to forget, as Engels (1958, pp. 54-73) would remind us,

owing to the curious lay-out of the town it is quite possible for someone to live for years in Manchester and to travel daily to and from his work without ever seeing a working-class quarter or coming into contact with an artisan. He who visits Manchester simply on business or for pleasure need never see the slums, mainly because the working-class districts and the middle-class districts are quite distinct.

But the density, pollution, and overpopulation of other cities, including London (see Figure 60), could not have remained totally hidden, not to Aminoddowleh nor to the other travelers. In their glorification of the imagined Other, the travelers seem incapable of accepting any imperfections. For an enchanted observer, there is nothing but beauty in what he sees.
Figure 60. Over London-by Rail, by Gustave Doré, 1870
CHAPTER V:

CONCLUSION

Consider, too, that I have stolen naught
In any library; and while our verse
Is of the Orient, I have not sought
To prate of that. You’ll find the tale no worse;
The east is vast and far! Great wonders rise
From memory, and travel dims the eyes.

Alfred de Musset (1905)—Namouna

TAJADDOD AS A DISCOURSE

In this section, I look at the underlying discursive network among the memoirs written by Iranian travelers who visited Farangestan in the 19\textsuperscript{th} century. The travelers do not directly quote other diaries; thus, separate studies of their writings may easily lead to the conclusion that a systematic interrelationship is unidentifiable. However, once the personal connections among the travelers are studied, a complex web of relationships appears that cannot be dismissed as irrelevant to their writings.

To report this complex nexus of personal and professional interactions, I shall start my chronological narrative from 1804, when the Russo-Persian war started. To secure the help of England in the aftermath of the war, the king of Iran, Fathali Shah, sent Mirza Abolhasan Khan Ilchi to England in 1809. During this trip, Ilchi kept a detailed diary entitled Heyratnameh, which is among the first 19\textsuperscript{th}-century Persian travel memoirs. In 1815, Ilchi was sent to Saint Petersburg as special envoy to negotiate for the return of the occupied Iranian territories. In St. Petersburg, where Ilchi remained for two years, he met a group of students, who were being sent to Europe by the Iranian state officials. Among the officials was Mirza Mas’ud Mostowfi who was also influential in the process of selecting the candidates to study abroad (Shirazi, 1985, p. 43). Among these students were Hajibaba Afshar and Mirza Saleh. In his memoir, Mirza Saleh mentions Ilchi a few times and
reports on an instance when the students and Ilchi spent an evening together at a theater in Saint Petersburg (Shirazi, 1985, p. 119). They also met later in London. Ilchi’s political mission was unsuccessful but he brought back a memoir on the accounts of his travel to Russia (Ilchi, 1984).

Ilchi was appointed as the foreign minister of Iran in 1824. In 1829, when he was assigned for a diplomatic mission to Russia, Ilchi made excuses to avoid the trip. In his replacement, Fathali Shah’s grandson, Khosrow Mirza, who was also Rezaqoli’s cousin, led the diplomatic envoy. Among Khosrow Mirza’s delegation were two of the previously mentioned students, Hajibaba Afshar and Mirza Saleh. Also notable among the group was Mirza Mohammad Khan Zanganeh, Mirza Mas’ud Mostowfi (who succeeded Ilchi as the foreign minister), and Amir Kabir. 20 years later Amir Kabir became the chief minister of Iran and, as many scholars agree, “Iran’s first reformer” and modernizer (Molavi, 2005). Khosrow Mirza’s trip also resulted in a travel memoir (M. Afshar, 1970).

Prior to his death in 1834, Fathali Shah sent representatives to Fars, Iran. The mission of this team, which had Ilchi as one of its members, was to secure the overdue taxes from the governor of Fars, Hoseyn-ali Farmanfarma (Eslami, 2014, p. 95). The king’s death put an end to this mission. Fathali’s grandson, Mohammad Shah (1808-1848), defeated his rivals and became the king of Iran. Notable among his rivals were his brother, Khosrow Mirza, who was captured and blinded, and his uncle Farmanfarma, Rezaqoli’s father, who was detained. To seek protection for their father, Rezaqoli and his brothers fled to England.

In 1838, Moḥammad Shah and his foreign minister, Ilchi, decided to send a mission to England. The person assigned to lead this mission was Hoseyn Khan Ajudanbashi, who had previously shown his abilities as Mohammad Khan Zanganeh’s deputy. Part of Ajudanbashi’s mission in England was to communicate Iran’s disapproval of the British government’s decision to provide asylum to the three fugitive princes, Rezaqoli and his brothers. Ajudanbashi’s secretary kept an account of this trip under the title “Ajudanbashi’s Mission” (Mushiri, 1968). Upon
return to Iran, Ajudanbashi became the governor of Yazd and later the governor of Fars. He was eventually forced out of office and jailed by Amir Kabir (Eslami, 2014).

In addition to the aforementioned personal relationships between the travelers, a less direct but more important connection is also identifiable: their ties with certain British agents. The nature of these relationships is different among the travelers; some of the travelers provided political service for the British agents and received salaries for their cooperation (Ilchi, 1986, p. 42), others collaborated in scholarly activities, which were sometimes not even recognized (Tavakoli-Targhi, 2001, pp. 32-33). Here, I shall introduce three of these English men and discuss their relationships with each traveler. These three people, who as George Curzon (1892, p. 24) believes, “have for so long formed the basis of English ideas about Persia, viz., Morier, Ouseley, and Fraser.” For this study, their importance lies not in the ideas they have formed about Persia in England, but in their roles in filtering and instilling a certain image of modern Europe in the travelers’ minds.

James Justinian Morier (1780-1849) was a British diplomat and author. He first visited Iran in 1808 as secretary to the British envoy. On his way to Tehran, Morier was received by the governor of Fars, Farmanfarma. In his memoirs he also mentions Farmanfarma’s son and Rezaqoli’s brother, Teymur Mirza (Morier, 1812). Upon his return to England in the same year, he accompanied the Iranian Ambassador, Ilchi. Morier is specially noted for his (1851) Picaresque novel, Hajji Baba of Ispaham. Morier took the name of his main character from Hajibaba Afshar, whom he had met during the aforementioned trip to England. Hajibaba Afshar was quite displeased with the deliberate abuse of his name for the vain, ignorant, and foolish character (Amanat, 2003). Scholars mostly believe that the character of Hajibaba of Ispahan was, nonetheless, based on Ilchi. Morier not only had the chance to interact with Ilchi during his stay in London but again accompanied him on his return to Iran in 1810 as Secretary of Embassy (Morier, 1818).
In his travel diary Mirza Saleh (1985, p. 155) reports that Morier, as Secretary of Embassy in Iran, had sent multiple memorandums from Iran to the English government insisting that the students were sent to England without his permission. These letters caused quite some difficulty for Mirza Saleh and his friends in pursuing their studies.

Sir Gore Ouseley (1770-1844) was a British orientalist and diplomat. In 1809, he was appointed as the official host of Ilchi during his stay in England. Ouseley was also designated as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Qajar court. He accompanied Ilchi in his return to Iran. Ouseley joined Ilchi in his mission to Russia, where he played an important role in the negotiation between Iran and Russia that led to the Golestan treaty of 1813, signed by Ilchi (Avery, 2004).

Mirza Saleh had met Ouseley several times in his stay in England (Shirazi, 1985, pp. 177, 353) and had later collaborated with Ouseley and his brother, William, in studies on Iran (Price & Mirza Saleh, 1823, p. vi). In Shiraz, Iran, Mirza Saleh served as a guide for a delegation which included orientalists such as Ouseley and Mourier (Tavakoli-Targhi, 2001, p. 32).

Ouseley had met Rezaqoli and his brother a few time in England and had invited them to his house (Rezaqoli, 1994, pp. 355, 476). Three years later he attended Ajudanbashi, who disapproved of the reception of the brothers by the English government (Mushiri, 1968).

James Baillie Fraser (1783-1856) was a Scottish traveler, writer, and artist (Wright, 2000). Fraser came to Iran in 1821 and spent two years traveling many of the northwestern regions of the country. During his stay, Fraser had met Ilchi; he dedicates several pages of his memoir to Ilchi’s character, which he found “mean and dishonest” (Fraser, 1825, pp. 149-152).

Fraser was appointed escort officer to the Rezaqoli and his brothers during their three months stay in London in 1836. He also accompanied them on their return to Baghdad (Wright, 2000). In 1839, Fraser was again called to act as host to Ajudanbashi.
The network of direct and indirect connections between the travelers is illustrated in Figure 61. The relationship among the travelers cannot leave their writings unaffected. Their elitist circle not only empowers them to pursue their image of a modern Iran, but also affects their expectation and imagination of Farangestan. The historically constructed image of Farangestan, as amplified in multiple travel accounts, finds internal consistency through unconscious adjustments within the network of the aforementioned relationships. The Iranian perception of modernity, as a constructed phenomenon, deals principally not with its correspondence with modernity in the Europe, but with the internal consistency of the expectations about Farangestan. The constellation of such images gradually grows to shape a discourse of Persian modernity, tajaddod.
Figure 61. A diagram illustrating the network of direct and indirect connections between the travelers. Each solid box represents a traveler, in which the grey ones have written a memoir. The dashed boxes are the British officers who interacted with the travelers.

To show the discursive nature of the Iranian experience of modernity, the etymology of *tajaddod* is enlightening. Prominent scholars on 19th-century Iranian history disagree on when the concept first appeared in Persian literature. Abbas Amanat, through personal correspondence, suggested that the concept “entered Persian modernist vocabulary via Ottoman Empire perhaps during the Constitutional era.” 
Constitutional Revolution of Mashruteh took place between 1905 and 1907. Jamshid Behnam (2009) also believes that the concept was first coined in the Ottoman Empire; however, a report on his talk at the Toronto Book Club quotes him on claiming “the first person who used the word tajaddod was Sheikh [Mohammad] Khiyabani [1880–1920]” (Taheri, 2012). Tajaddod was the name of the newspaper that Khiyabani founded in April 1917 (Parvin, 2004); therefore, Behnam’s assertion makes more sense if he is referring to Khiyabani as the person who first publicized the concept. Although it not known exactly when the word was first coined, it is common understanding that “the concept became popular at the end of the 19th century” (Jadid Bonab, 2007).

The earliest use of the word, as encountered in this study, is in fact in a safarnameh and is referring to the reformist movement in the Ottoman Empire. Discussing the reforms initiated by Mahmud II (the 30th Sultan of the Ottoman Empire who ruled from 1808 to 1839), Rezaqoli (1994, p. 704) in 1836 uses the phrase “nehzat-e tajaddod khahi,” which literally means the tajaddod-ist movement. It is probable that Rezaqoli had heard the word during his stay in Istanbul, but his application of the concept, especially with the Persian suffix “khahi” [desire or demand], seems to be among the very first written expressions of tajaddod in Persian.

It is interesting to note that tajaddod, although an Arabic word, is not the Arabic equivalent for modernity. In Arabic, “hadatha” signifies modernity, which brings up a legitimate question: what does tajaddod mean? Tajaddod, in Arabic, means “renewal;” and in fact, the 19th-century understanding of modernity, as Behnam (Alinejad, 2005) clarifies, was about change and renewal. The leading figures of the 1906 Mashruteh movement, such as Mirza Agha khan Kermani and Mirza Fathali Akhundzadeh used the French transcription “changement” interchangeably with tajaddod (Alinejad, 2005). The new generations of Iranian scholars, who aim to replace Arabic words with Persian equivalents, have constructed concepts such as “nogeraei” (Wikipedia, 2014) and “novaregi” (Habibi & Ahari, 2007) to avoid the Arabic tajaddod in their translations of modernity. Interestingly, both words mean renewal! It seems that almost two centuries after tajaddod was
first used, its discursive nature still influences the Iranian reading of modernity.

**TRACKING THE ROOTS IN THE ROUTES**

While architectural historiography in Iran has depended mostly on archeological findings, the circulation of architectural ideas has remained neglected. This study appreciates travel writing as a mode of transferring architectural ideas. It suggests that the route that Farangi architecture takes from Europe to Iran is a perceptual journey departing from the self but arriving at a preimagined Other.

To communicate their observations of architecture and urbanism in Farangestan, the travelers adopted different linguistic strategies. They either constructed novel concepts or referred to the closest words in Persian vocabulary to communicate objects, spaces, and experiences that the audience had never been exposed to. Yet, in the course of their travels, they gradually gained a more diverse conceptual framework to express their insights on the built environment. Their more vivid and complex vocabulary, however, rather than generating a clearer picture of European space, enriched their articulation of an imagined Farangestan.

The travelers challenge in articulating unfamiliar architecture and urban experiences was a symptom of a deeper dilemma, the fact that their conventional mental tools to analyze space were dysfunctional. To map the novel spatial elements that the travelers witnessed in their voyage, their culturally constructed elements to explore the image of the city were inadequate. They thus felt the necessity to get equipped with analytical tools in order to efficiently orient themselves in the foreign Farangi space. An example for the new analytical tools of space evaluation that the travelers mastered during their trip is the functional division of architectural space. Yet, neglecting their programmatic potential, the traveler found function-specific spaces as a luxurious feature in Farangestan’s architecture.
Farangestan in general and “Farangi style of building” (Rezaqoli, 1994, p. 215) in particular gain their meaning not from outside referents, but as an alternative to the self. Farangi house, as the travelers expected, in contrast to the existing pattern of architecture in Iran, was multi-story, spatially extroverted, and integrated public and private spaces. This preconceived image of Farangestan was more authentic than its objective reality; therefore, in many cases that the image contradicted their observation, the travelers, instead of dialectically readjusting their conceptions, twisted the reality to conform to their expectation.

The expected Farangestan was a fairy-tale world full of exotic objects, magical gadgets, and strange habits. As people who had an exclusive access to this wonderland, the travelers actively took part in the process of enriching its mysterious qualities through linguistic tools such as exaggeration and fictive writing. Naturally, the travelers had a tendency not to demystify Farangestan, by revealing the technical explanations behind the splendor of Farangi progress. Construction techniques and design details thus hold a small share in architectural descriptions in the travel diaries. The scarcity of construction descriptions in the travel accounts can also be a result of illusionary perception of architecture by the travelers, which was reinforced through the magical quality of new artistic mediums that the travelers were introduced to. The substitutability of real and virtual in mediums such as panoramas, dioramas, photography, was a quality that the travelers sough in architecture. The wonders of Farangi architecture were surreal and therefore any in-depth research on construction details would ruin its magical charm.

In their attempt to re-mystify Farangestan, the travelers were eager to report on places and objects that held some kind of record. Among abundantly used superlative adjective, the ones relating to the magnitude of a buildings were especially frequent in the diaries. Grandeur of buildings had such an impression on the travelers that they considered it an indicator of space quality. This extreme appreciation of largeness in architecture is also reflected in the use of metaphoric language to romanticize the magnitude of buildings.
Similar to the role of “largeness” in evaluating architectural quality, “wideness” served the same function for streets. Unlike the organic urban pattern of the central cities in Iran, which had curved narrow alleys, the wide, straight, and green streets in Farangestan resembled the Kucheh-bagh pattern with its linear alignment and side orchards. The wide street fantasy was later carried out through the very first planning attempts in Iran known as the “street-widening act.”

As the kuch-e-bagh ideal influenced the travelers’ perception of Farangi streets, Persian garden and its char-bagh layout informed their conception of Farangi gardens. The travelers’ strong desire for gardens and landscapes is reflected in their poetic tone. This glorification of nature alludes to the pastoral essence of the Islamic heaven, which was solidified through the dreamlike qualities of the controlled environments of greenhouses that, like the Garden of Eden, offered fruits and flowers of different climates and seasons.

Similar heavenly qualities were also pursued inside buildings. Finding their erotic expectation of heaven in Farangestan, where men and women flirted freely, the travelers sought its spatial materialization in the mixture of public and private zones of a building. In contrast to the rigid segregation between andaruni and biruni in their contemporary Persian houses, Farangestan architecture, in the travelers’ eyes, assumed no boundaries. It was erotic in the sense that it had nothing to hide, nothing to cover, and unlike the spatially introverted architecture of the hot and arid regions of the Islamic world, it faced outward with windows that boldly looked at strangers and shamelessly offered them a peek at the buildings’ private parts.

The glamorous nightlife of European cities, which to the travelers was only possible through the miracle of streetlights, also provoked their fantasies of a heaven on earth. All of the studied travel accounts share a sensational description of streetlights, in which its splendor could only be communicated though metaphoric signifiers such as moons, stars, and daylight. Derived from Persian literature, such descriptions produced an image in the readers’ mind that associates more with a poetic Persian/Sufi utopia rather than what the author has actually
observed. Later in 1907, this desire for street lights becomes institutionalized through the municipal governance law, known as Ghanun-e Baladiyeh, which had put the municipality in charge of “providing city light” (Tavakoli-Targhi, 2009, p. 451).

Cleanliness, as a quality that was deeply appreciated, yet somewhat absent, in the Islamic-Iranian culture of the travelers, was also sought in Farangi urbanism. The public demand for fighting contagious diseases caused by unhygienic conditions in Iran later lead to state-initiated sanitary projects that according to Tavakoli-Targhi (2009, pp. 421-422) laid the early foundations of Iranian modernity.

Cleanliness, to the travelers, was part of the broader idea of order. From early in their voyage, the travelers felt that everything including space in Farangestan follows some kind of underlying order. Occasionally, the travelers’ imagination about the state of this regulatory order surpassed reality. The travelers’ membership in the Masonic lodge was in part an attempt to access the assumed secrets behind the order and progress of Farangestan. Fascination in the order seen in the spatial layouts of European buildings and cities on the one hand reflected the travelers’ desire for the sovereignty of law and on the other hand legitimized state interference in public urban projects.

The concept of public space was novel and somewhat confusing to the travelers. Sometimes they understood it as a place that belongs to nobody (Rezaqoli, 1994, p. 371) and sometimes as a place that belongs to everybody (Rezaqoli, 1994, p. 539). Some of the travelers attempted to define public space through the closest concept in Islamic law, i.e. a waqf (endowed) space (Rezaqoli, 1994, p. 539), while others defined it through similar concepts in Iranian culture such as spaces where eyd gatherings and mourning rituals took place (Aminoddowleh, 1994, p. 282). Through their journey, the travelers gradually educated themselves about the concept of “public.” Mentions of the words 'am and 'omum (the public) are expectedly not very frequent and begin rather late in the travels.
The idea of mutual responsibilities between the 'omum (the public) and the state as well as its manifestation in spatial planning has a surprisingly significant presence in the travel memoirs. While references to urban services were usually focused on their visible aspects, leaving the descriptions of the underlying infrastructure to a more general speculation, the state’s role in the construction of public projects as well as providing basic infrastructure was recognized by the travelers.

While the travelers greatly emphasized how the 'omum in Farangestan, did not clad based on social class, they were unable to recognize a similar pattern in space. Not only did they neglect democratization of space, in a sense that integrates people regardless of their social class, but they accentuated patterns of spatial hierarchies in their writing. Holding to their preconceptions on spatial hierarchy, procession, and symmetry, the travelers were not eager to abandon their interest in the spatial manifestation of power and centralization. Their interest in the spatial segregation of social classes emerged partially from the high status that they enjoyed.

The travelers’ high ranks had given them access to many royal palaces and noble houses. Yet their description of such spaces is different from their writings about similarly significant buildings in Iran in its discussion of materiality. While in Iran they frequently mentioned conventionally celebrated material, such as gold, silver, marble, and lapis lazuli, in Europe, the description of material shows a shift to granite, which in classic Persian literature is a metaphor for firmness. Although the travelers gradually get to appreciate the value of modern architectural materials such as iron, the tectonic relationship between granite and firmness was more visible to them. Being visually adapted to an understanding of stability that was tied with grandeur and solidness, the travelers were quite shocked by thin cast iron columns and iron bridges.

Firmness and durability served as the prominent criteria to measure rationally built structures; yet rational design, to the travelers, was also reflected in the abandonment of ornamentation. Considering
ornament as a waste of time and resources (Aminoddowleh, 1994, p. 372; Rezaqoli, 1994, p. 530) was a theoretical stance that the travelers had taken gradually throughout their travel. Yet, similar to early modern advocates for abandonment of architectural ornaments in Europe, the travelers’ later constructions enjoyed many decorative features, especially frescos, which had caught their attention in Europe. The travelers’ fascination in frescos was partially because representational paintings of living objects, as symbol of idolatry, were prohibited in their Islamic culture.

BUILDING THE IMAGINARY

The image of a progressive Farangestan is a social construction that, besides the actual architectural setting that the travelers visited, employs preconceived mental material. First, the shared spatial ideals and values that the travelers hold, such as the appreciation of gardens and fountains, influence this process. The travelers’ selectiveness towards what they choose to represent is partially influenced by a confirmation bias. In other words, the travelers show a tendency to seek facts that confirm their predisposed conception of Farangestan and ignore evidence that refutes the internal coherence of their imagination. Farangestan with all its wonders thus serves as a canvas on which the travelers can fill the blanks with their utopian vistas. This utopian imagery is rooted in the shared desires and values that Iranians seek and respect. Attempts to domesticate the Farangi space are part of their effort to construct a hybrid notion of tajaddod that would conform to such desires. Fraser informs us that right after Vali, the eldest prince, had arrived to London, and as they were returning from Regents Park,

[the prince] began to gaze about him with new interest. ‘Ah! che khoob jaee,’ said he, as we passed Primrose-Hill, ‘what a fine place is this! This is something like, now; this reminds me of Persia. There I would just wish to wander about or ride on that sahra’ (Fraser, 1973, p. 92).
Second, the spatial qualities that Iran lacks are selectively sought and amplified in the representations of Farangestan. Tajaddod, thus, lends its meaning to a pathological approach towards the condition of Iran in the first half of 19th century. Similarly, the construction of modern architecture in Iran is in part a reaction to the state of its built environment. For the travelers, haphazard development, organic orders of construction, curved and narrow streets, and even mud-brick are signs of architectural backwardness. Therefore, the constant longing for spatial order, planning and architectural regulations, cleanliness, alternative materials, and straight paved streets, indicates the travelers’ attempt to project their self-pathology onto Farangi space.

Third, the elitist background of the travelers shows itself in the appreciation of the grandeur, symmetry, and hierarchical order of space. Naturally, the experience of modernity for each traveler varied based on their background, personality, knowledge, and even external factors such as the places they visited. For example, Mirza Saleh, who was a student without any aristocratic ties, showed more interest in the social services provided by the government. Rezaqoli and Aminoddowleh, on the other hand, were quite fascinated in the constitutional order and the absolute rule of law. Aminoddowleh also showed great interest in progress caused by what we today refer to as the market economy. Therefore, it is important to note that while much of the mental process in building upon a utopian imagery of Farangestan occurs naturally and unconsciously, the agency of the travelers in their selective representation cannot be ignored. This agency appears not only in the substance of what they write about, e.g. deliberate omissions of what the travelers felt could harm the utopian image of Farangestan, but also in their writing style. Being members of the elite circle, the travelers were quite aware of the literary tradition of safarnameh in Persian. They were all learned men, who could employ their literary skills, religious training, familiarity with Persian classic poetry, acquaintance with Iran’s power structure, common knowledge of society, and their story-telling techniques to communicate
their ideas and in cases exaggerate the facts and manipulate the readers.

Had Farangi progress been introduced to Iran through the lower classes, tajaddod might have seen a different course. Being less attached to the traditions and cultures that had positioned them in inferior levels of the social structure, the lower classes had higher motivation to embrace modernity. In fact, two of Rezaqoli’s servants, a cook and a tailor, had decided to stay in London. Although Fraser (1973, p. 310 & 311) suggests that the reason that the servants did not want to return to Iran was the “bad habits” of sex and alcohol that they had got into, the tailor’s account, “that he had entered into engagements with a master of his own craft, by which he was to get board, lodging, and good wages,” sounds more plausible. Either way, the lower class travelers showed less interest to return to their previous conditions and found the Farangi order of life a better alternative for their future. The unfortunate servants of Rezaqoli and his brothers were forced to return to their previous stage of life; yet, Iran’s history never returned to its pre-tajaddod stage.

The aforementioned three steps in the travelers’ mental odyssey shaped a syncretic perception of space, rooted in their own culture but projected on their expectation of Farangestan. Being connected to political power, the travelers enjoyed a position to carry out some of their syncretic experiences, as introduced in the memoirs. Besides the ideas that the travelers directly implemented upon return to Iran (some which were discussed on page 41), many of the introduced concepts were well received by the elites who had access to these writings. As mentioned earlier, Naseraddin Shah himself had ordered many of his ambassadors to report their observations of Farangestan in a safarnameh format. Apparently, these ideas, although helped the modernizer Shah to rearticulate his vision for Iran, were unable to totally satisfy his curiosity in Farangestan. The Shah felt the urge to personally take part in what his modernizer vizier calls, “the grand path to Iran’s progress” (Adamiyat, 1972). In his three travels to Europe in 1873, 1879, and 1889 Naseraddin Shah took most of the influential members of his cabinet along. “It is not only the Shah who is traveling to
Farangestan,” as the same vizier, Sepahsalar, observed, “but the entire government is seeking salvation by studying global affairs” (Adamiyat, 1972). Interestingly, the Shah also took part in expanding the safarnamah tradition by keeping notes in all his travels (N. Shah, 1990, 1998, 2000). Naseraddin Shah’s successor, Mozaffaraddin Shah, who signed the 1907 constitution, also kept record of his multiple travels to Farangestan in 1900, 1903, and 1905 (M. Shah, 1983, 2011).

In addition to this indirect, yet significant, influence that the travel accounts had on Iran’s experience of modernity, a more concrete spatial influence can be sought in the architectural practices that many of the travelers conducted upon return to Iran. These architectural projects confirm the priority of the preexisting image of Farangestan to architectural style of Europe in the 19th century.

As mentioned previously, Aminoddowleh constructed his house in three stories and was responsible for the first paving of streets in Tehran. Although his house in Kashan has been demolished, descriptions of his office in Tehran exist. In his diary, Eastwick (1864, p. 260) explains:

  We… went first to Aminoddowleh, whom I had met before in England… He received us in an upper room, the ceiling of which was covered with pictures of fair women, while the walls were tastefully adorned with glass, with many facets and enamel.

Some scholars, including Aminoddowleh’s grandson, Hasanali Ghaffari, who has written a preface to Aminoddowleh’s memoir, suggest that Aminoddowleh was the founder of a mosque in Chalehmeydan, Tehran (Aminoddowleh, 1994, p. 13; Sa'adatnuri, 1966, p. 423). It is quite possible that these scholars are referring to Fakhrroddowleh mosque, also known as Aminoddowleh mosque, which happens to be located on a street, previously called Chalehmeydan. In that case, they have confused Aminoddowleh with Mirza Ali khan, who shared the same title of “Aminoddowleh,” and was in fact partially responsible for the structure.

Aminoddowleh, however, supervised the construction of Iran’s most celebrated bazaar in Kashan, Iran, known as Timcheh-ye Aminoddowleh
(see Figure 62 and Figure 63). This structure deviates from the dominant styles of its contemporary architecture in its dynamism, materiality, and grandiosity, and yet reflects the aesthetics and symbolism that the traditions of Islamic architecture manifest. Me’mar Helli, a master builder and expert in Kashan’s premodern practices of architecture, believes that no other bazaar in Iran has the height and width of Timcheh-ye Aminoddowleh. In addition to various styles of ornamentation, the building has many frescos, which was quite unprecedented in the bazaar typology. Apparently, Aminoddowleh had also funded constructions in the bazaar of Tehran. His interest in the commercial typology seemed to have shaped during his trip to Europe. In his conversation with Napoleon III, the emperor had told him that “strong financial relationships will build strong friendship amongst nations” (Aminoddowleh, 1994, p. 196). Aminoddowleh, later in his travel account, describes a “wise, intelligent, insightful, and knowledgeable merchant” and quotes him in saying, “no progress happens in any state unless by the means of businessmen” (Aminoddowleh, 1994, p. 270).
Figure 62. Drawing of Timcheh-ye Aminoddowleh, Kashan, Iran
According to Asghar Farmanfarmaei, the editor of Rezaqoli Mirza’s travel diary, Rezaqoli funded the construction of the Bager-Abad mosque in Shiraz (Figure 64). The building however dates back to the Zand dynasty, which ended in late 18th Century. Also, the plaque inscriptions name a different person as the founder of the building. Farmanfarmaei’s explanation that “Rezaqoli had concealed his name as a sign of modesty” is not convincing (Rezaqoli, 1994, p. 746). If we accept the claim of Farmanfarmaei and his only source, Akbar Nozari, who is Rezaqoli’s descendant, still the building has not much to offer to this study, because Rezaqoli had died on his way to Iran in 1862. Since Rezaqoli, after leaving Europe, took asylum in Iraq and never returned to Shiraz, his influences on the mosque would have been minimal and limited to providing funds.
Figure 64. Baqer-Abad Mosque, known to be founded by Rezaqoli. Courtesy of Mehdi Parsaei
There is no historic evidence to suggest Mirza Saleh participated in any architectural project. However, Mirza Reza Mohandes, one of the other students in the group that was sent to Europe with Mirza Saleh, had drawn the plan of Darolfonun, Iran’s first modern institution of higher education (Gurney & Nabavi, 1993). Following the traditional layout of educational architecture in Iran, Darolfonun had a central courtyard, where the surrounding rooms faced. The rooms had the same four by four square meter plan and the courtyard had a huge reflecting pool in the middle. To accommodate the new spatial requirements for the increasing number of students, the building undergone a major development in 1890, in which most of the older sections were destroyed.

Ajudanbashi participated in many urban and architectural projects when he became the governor of Yazd and Fars (Eslami, 2014; Mushiri, 1968, p. 13); among his projects were a number of aqueducts, forts, road construction projects, and qanats, i.e. underground water distribution systems. Ilchi supervised the construction of a mosque in Tehran (Ilchi, 1986, p. 37). His house has also been notable in terms of the new architectural elements the he used. In his memoir, Fraser (1825, p. 152) reports:

The person [Ilchi] received us in a sort of boudoir, highly ornamented with English prints and mirrors, French clocks, and other gimbots, among which was placed, in a conspicuous situation, a picture of himself, by a Russian artist: a comfortable carpet with numuds as usual, covered the floor, but there was also an excellent fire blazing in an European grate; and the whole had much more comfort, than is usually to be met with in Persian apartments. He showed us his whole ménage, and by its arrangement, it was sufficiently apparent that he had picked up some idea of convenience, as well as other good things in England; he did not however approve completely of the plan of our English house; he thought them deficient in ground space, and that the rooms were much too small.
The study of the specific architecture and urban details in the projects that the travelers constructed, supervised, or funded, especially as they relate to the descriptions of Farangi architecture in the memoirs, is a research study that I hope to pursue in the future. Another possible study could focus on the counter-discourses that emerged as a reaction to tajaddod. Articulating recent nationalistic and Islamist movements in the region as counter-discourses aiming at, not modernity as understood in the West but rather, local modernities changes our approach in dealing with regional conflicts. Such counter-discourses have generated many sub-cultures within architecture as well that could also serve as an interesting research topic for architectural historians.

To conclude this study, I shall again refer to Asghar Farhadi, this time from his 2009, “About Elly.” The story is around a group of middle-class Iranian couples, all friends from their college days, who take on a trip to the shores of the Caspian. Sepideh, who has organized the trip, brings along her daughter’s school teacher, Elly, in the hope to link her with another member of the group who has recently got divorced. All signs in the plot point to a potential marriage between the two. Besides Sepideh, who believes that after a day the group “will all fall in love with her,” everyone finds Elly a “nice,” “kind,” “warm,” “quiet,” and “uncomplicated” girl.

A tragic event, however, changes this pattern. When Elly goes missing, a disastrous sequence unfurls. Those who suspect that Elly has left without notice now see her as “immature” and “unreasonable.” It turns out that nobody knew Elly as much as they supposed. She is now considered “a girl you don’t know nothing about.” The enigma around Elly grows especially later in the film, where the group is shocked by the appearance of Elly’s fiancé. The party feels fooled by “a show she played for [them]:”

- But an engaged woman looking for a husband, this means, 1) she fooled us all, 2) she fooled her fiancé.
- Fooled?
- Obviously! If you have a boyfriend and your boyfriend finds a girl better than you for the weekend, to play volleyball ...

- Where's the harm?

- You don't understand. From our “point of view,” there is no harm. Put yourself in the position of the boy [fiancé], and everything is evil.

The enigma of *tajaddod* is also a matter of viewpoint, nevertheless, similar to Elly’s story, the total truth, even if accessible, is secondary to the main problem and thus irrelevant to our contemporary lives. The first generation of travelers who visited modern Europe had a judgment about modernity, which, quite similar to how the group in the movie initially perceived Elly, was filled with charm and attraction. They may not have known the history and background of modernity, as the group did not even know Elly’s full name, yet they had a gut-feeling about it, which they decided to trust.

Today, our understanding of *tajaddod* is quite similar to the children’s memory of Elly in the movie. Similar to “a Separation,” the children here again symbolize the future. In the tragic drowning of Elly, although this generation gets marginalized by the parents, the trauma affects them in more direct way, even resulting in an instance of bedwetting. It is as if this generation is held responsible for the loss of Elly, who according to one of the parents, “drowned because of Arash [his child].” Although as we learn from Arash’s mom, “everyone disrespects him,” he and the other kids are in fact more close to the actual events than their parents assume and accept. The police, for example, is quite unsatisfied that, for their basic information about Elly, the “have to rely on a child.” Similar to the children in the movie, the new generations of Iranian people are today unable to comprehend the relevance of the never-ending hypothetical inquisitions about the missing *tajaddod*:

- When you were in the water, did Elly come to help you?

- ...
- Raise your head and answered correctly.
- I answered a hundred times yesterday.
- Sit down and answer well!
- I'm hungry.
- Get out of here then!

For us today, however, modernity has no original conception. It is as if it had drowned many years ago; all we have is the memory, which is itself shaped by narrations that cannot be totally verified. We are now in the same position that Sepideh was when confronted by Elly’s fiancé, in the final sequence of the movie. She was left with a decision, to either lie about the events “to save the honor of Elly,” or to “tell the truth,” by which “Elly will be dishonored,” in favor of saving herself from the embarrassment of persuading the engaged Elly to meet a new person. As one of the characters of the movie says “We must decide now.” The matter of modernity in Iran, is not about a concrete truth anymore, it about a “decision.” The search for the drowned body of European modernity in the seas of Iran’s intellectual history is irrelevant, even if not in vain. The constructed image of *tajaddod* is what matters now. To dichotomous viewpoints “about *tajaddod*” are secondary to the fact that such images are based on expectations about modernity, which in every historical event, would find a new meaning. *Tajaddod* in this sense should be sought not in unchartered waters but in the eyes of the beholders.
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**APPENDIX A**

Mirza Saleh’s detailed itinerary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>Tabriz</td>
<td>05/19/1815</td>
<td>Mentions the bath, the caravanserai, and the bridge. Visited the cemetery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>Sufian</td>
<td>05/19/1815</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>Marand</td>
<td>05/20/1815</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>Gargar</td>
<td>05/21/1815</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>Jolfa</td>
<td>05/22/1815</td>
<td>Mentions the bath, the caravanserai, and the bridge. Visited the cemetery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>Nakhchivan</td>
<td>05/23/1815</td>
<td>Mentions the city gate, two brick minarets, a mosque, a dome and a castle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>Xok</td>
<td>05/24/1815</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>Sharur</td>
<td>05/25/1815</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>Artashat</td>
<td>05/26/1815</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>Yerevan</td>
<td>05/27/1815</td>
<td>Mentions the bath, the bazaar, and the castle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>Úç Kilise</td>
<td>05/29/1815</td>
<td>Visited the church.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>(Ashtarak)</td>
<td>05/29/1815</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>Karakilisa</td>
<td>06/01/1815</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>(Vanadzor)</td>
<td>06/01/1815</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>Ozonli</td>
<td>06/04/1815</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>Tbilisi</td>
<td>06/07/1815</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>(arrival)</td>
<td>06/07/1815</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>Tbilisi</td>
<td>06/22/1815</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>(departure)</td>
<td>06/22/1815</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>Dusheti</td>
<td>06/23/1815</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>Ananuri</td>
<td>06/23/1815</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>(Ananour)</td>
<td>06/23/1815</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>Pasanauri</td>
<td>06/24/1815</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>Stepantsminda</td>
<td>06/25/1815</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>(Kazbegi)</td>
<td>06/25/1815</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>Mozdok</td>
<td>06/28/1815</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>Alexandrov</td>
<td>07/05/1815</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>Stavropol</td>
<td>07/06/1815</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>Koskovskoye</td>
<td>07/09/1815</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>Donskoye</td>
<td>07/11/1815</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aksay</td>
<td>07/13/1815</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cherkessk</td>
<td>07/14/1815</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likhaya (Likhovskoy)</td>
<td>07/23/1815</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kamensk-Shakhtinsky</td>
<td>07/23/1815</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kazanskaya</td>
<td>07/26/1815</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voronezh</td>
<td>07/29/1815</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sadonsk (or) Zadonsk</td>
<td>08/01/1815</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yefermov</td>
<td>08/03/1815</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tula</td>
<td>08/03/1815</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serpukhov</td>
<td>08/06/1815</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moscow</td>
<td>08/09/1815</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khimki</td>
<td>08/21/1815</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solnechnogorsk (Solnechnaya Gora)</td>
<td>08/21/1815</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klin (Klinsky)</td>
<td>08/22/1815</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tver</td>
<td>08/23/1815</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torzhok (Torjok)</td>
<td>08/23/1815</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vyshny Volochyok</td>
<td>08/24/1815</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edrovo</td>
<td>08/25/1815</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirishi</td>
<td>08/26/1815</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borovichi</td>
<td>08/27/1815</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novgorod</td>
<td>08/27/1815</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spasskaya Polista</td>
<td>08/28/1815</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chudovo</td>
<td>08/28/1815</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Visited the arsenal. Mentions a castle with four towers.

Visited Kremlin, Ivan the Great Bell Tower, the Cathedral of the Archangel, the Cathedral of the Annunciation, Moscow State University, a library, an asylum, a theater, and a hospital, probably the Pavlovskaya Hospital or the Galitzine Hospital.

Mentions a big bridge.

Mentions a big bridge.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Activities/Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>St Petersburg</td>
<td>08/29/1815</td>
<td>Visited Peter and Paul Fortress, Cathedral, and bridge, the Winter Palace, the Imperial Hermitage Museum, the Hermitage Theatre, Saint Petersburg State University, and a military school, probably the Military Engineering-Technical University. Mentions a hospital; it is not clear which hospital and whether he visited the place himself.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Petersburg</td>
<td>09/07/1815</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kronstadt</td>
<td>09/08/1815</td>
<td>Mentions the Navy Hospital Complex and a school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>09/19/1815</td>
<td>Mentions the lighthouses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yarmouth</td>
<td>09/28/1815</td>
<td>Toured the city.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yarmouth</td>
<td>10/02/1815</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gravesend</td>
<td>10/03/1815</td>
<td>Went to the theater.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochester</td>
<td>10/12/1815</td>
<td>Mentions the Cathedral and the bridge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chatham</td>
<td>10/13/1815</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northfleet</td>
<td>10/13/1815</td>
<td>Mentions the church and barrack.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welling</td>
<td>10/13/1816</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>10/14/1816</td>
<td>Enters the city from Westminster Bridge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campton-London</td>
<td>03/13/1816</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croydon</td>
<td>03/13/1816</td>
<td>Stayed for 11 months.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>02/03/1817</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>05/21/1818</td>
<td>Mentions the Cathedral Church of the Blessed Virgin Mary, factories, and a charity school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salisbury</td>
<td>05/21/1818</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exeter</td>
<td>05/22/1818</td>
<td>Visited the Cathedral Church of Saint Peter at Exeter, factories, and a castle, probably the Rougemont Castle. Mentions two prisons, a charity school, the theater, a hospital, and a work house.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashburton</td>
<td>05/24/1818</td>
<td>Visited a coal mine close to the city, a wool-spinning factory, and a china manufacturer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plymouth</td>
<td>06/01/1818</td>
<td>Mentions the Royal Naval Hospital, the barrack, schools, churches, and the light house. Visited a naval ship and a copper mine. Attended the public celebration of King George III's birthday.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashburton</td>
<td>06/05/1818</td>
<td>Visited a marble mine close to the city.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>06/12/1818</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>10/10/1818</td>
<td>Visits the New College Chapel, Oxford Library, Christ Church, Botanic Garden, Radcliffe Observatory, and Radcliffe Science Library.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodstock</td>
<td>10/14/1818</td>
<td>Visited Blenheim Palace.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheltenham</td>
<td>10/16/1818</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloucester</td>
<td>10/17/1818</td>
<td>Visited Gloucester Cathedral and a prison. Visited a broadcloth manufacture and a dyeing factory. Visited a courthouse and a school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bristol</td>
<td>10/21/1818</td>
<td>Visited Hannah More in her house. Attended a sermon at a Unitarian Church.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clifton</td>
<td>10/23/1818</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bristol</td>
<td>10/24/1818</td>
<td>Went to the Bristol Cathedral and a hospital. Visited glass and china factories, iron foundry, textile factory, and soap boiling manufacturer. Mentions the Bristol Asylum for the Blind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bath</td>
<td>10/28/1818</td>
<td>Visited the Royal Crescent, the circus, Queen Square, the Bath Abbey, and the Sydney garden. Went to the theater and a Unitarian Chapel. Mentions a Cathedral, a charity school, a hospital, and a library.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windsor</td>
<td>11/02/1818</td>
<td>Visited William Herschel in his house and saw his reflecting telescope. Participated in Queen Charlotte's funeral in St George's Chapel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London (arrival)</td>
<td>11/04/1818</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London (departure)</td>
<td>06/13/1819</td>
<td>Visited the schools, the King's College Chapel, and the botanical garden. Mentions a hospital, a museum, and a library.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>06/13/1819</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>06/17/1819</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>07/23/1819</td>
<td>(arrival)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gravesend</td>
<td>07/24/1819</td>
<td>(departure)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gibraltar</td>
<td>08/11/1819</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malta (arrival)</td>
<td>09/01/1819</td>
<td>Toured the city. Visited St. John's Co-Cathedral and Grandmaster's Palace. Visited St. Paul's church in Rabat and the Catacombs. Visited the Gardjola Garden.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malta (departure)</td>
<td>09/05/1819</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dardanelles</td>
<td>09/05/1819</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Istanbul (departure)</td>
<td>10/23/1819</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kartal</td>
<td>10/23/1819</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gebze</td>
<td>10/24/1819</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>İzmit</td>
<td>10/25/1819</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sapanca</td>
<td>10/26/1819</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Düzce</td>
<td>10/27/1819</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolu</td>
<td>10/28/1819</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerede</td>
<td>10/28/1819</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamamlı</td>
<td>10/29/1819</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Çerkeş</td>
<td>10/30/1819</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karacaviran (Kuşulu)</td>
<td>10/30/1819</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Çörekçiler</td>
<td>10/30/1819</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tosya</td>
<td>10/31/1819</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hacıhamza</td>
<td>11/01/1819</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osmancık</td>
<td>11/02/1819</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amasya</td>
<td>11/04/1819</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tokat</td>
<td>11/07/1819</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niksar</td>
<td>11/07/1819</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koyulhisar</td>
<td>11/08/1819</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sebinkarahisar</td>
<td>11/10/1819</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Şiran</td>
<td>11/12/1819</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aşkale</td>
<td>11/15/1819</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erzurum</td>
<td>11/16/1819</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX B

Rezaqoli’s detailed itinerary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ottoman</td>
<td>Najaf</td>
<td>10/30/1835</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kufa</td>
<td>11/01/1835</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hillah</td>
<td>11/02/1835</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Karbala</td>
<td>11/03/1835</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Musayib</td>
<td>11/08/1835</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kadhimayn</td>
<td>11/09/1835</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baghdad</td>
<td>11/15/1835</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>01/03/1836</td>
<td>Departure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Haditha</td>
<td>01/21/1836</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Duma</td>
<td>02/03/1836</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Damascus</td>
<td>02/05/1836</td>
<td>Visited the Cave of the Seven Sleepers. Mentions the Umayyad Mosque.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>03/25/1836</td>
<td>Departure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baalbek</td>
<td>03/25/1836</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hamanah</td>
<td>03/25/1836</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beirut</td>
<td>03/26/1836</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>04/09/1836</td>
<td>Departure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Britain</td>
<td>Alexandria</td>
<td>04/12/1836</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Malta</td>
<td>04/21/1836</td>
<td>Were kept in quarantine.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>05/05/1836</td>
<td>Departure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gibraltar</td>
<td>05/12/1836</td>
<td>Observed a military maneuver.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Cádiz</td>
<td>05/15/1836</td>
<td>One of the princes, Teymur Mirza, visited the cathedral.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>Falmouth</td>
<td>05/22/1836</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exeter</td>
<td>05/25/1826</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bath</td>
<td>05/25/1826</td>
<td>Stayed at York House Hotel. Mentions the burning of a church, probably Prior Park House. Visited a glass-house.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>London</td>
<td>06/12/1836</td>
<td>Arrival. Stayed at Mivart’s Hotel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>06/14/1836</td>
<td>Visited a flower-show at the Surrey Zoological Gardens.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/16/1836</td>
<td>Attended Lord Marchioness's party.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/17/1836</td>
<td>The Royal Prince of Orange visited them.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/18/1836</td>
<td>Observed the public celebration for the anniversary of the battle of Waterloo held in Hyde Park.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/19/1836</td>
<td>Britain's Secretary for Foreign Affairs visited the princes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/20/1836</td>
<td>Visited the Coliseum in Regent's Park as well as the Zoological Gardens.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/21/1836</td>
<td>Accompanied by the ambassador of Oud, they visited the exhibition of Somerset-house. Saw an opera, Siege of Rochelle, at Theatre Royal, Drury Lane.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/24/1836</td>
<td>Visited a house of arts, which seems to be a sort of museum that presents scientific and industrial achievements, instruments, and inventions. They mention seeing an iron bridge, a diving bell, train, machine guns, and some kind of magnifying apparatus that reflected microscopic images on a screen to be viewed by the public.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/27/1836</td>
<td>Were invited to the house of the Secretary for Foreign Affairs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/29/1836</td>
<td>Visited King's College in the morning. In the afternoon, they went to Vauxhall and were amused by the fireworks, skating, and rope dancing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/30/1836</td>
<td>Visited London Bridge, Thames Tunnel, and Greenwich Railway.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Event Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/01/1836</td>
<td>Rochester</td>
<td>Observed a military exhibition at near Rochester that involved throwing pontoon bridges over the Medway.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/03/1836</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>Were invited to the house of a diplomat who had served in Iran for two years. The house was close to Hammersmith suspension bridge and the princes got to examine it closely.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/04/1836</td>
<td></td>
<td>Witnessed a rowing-match.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/06/1836</td>
<td>Windsor</td>
<td>Visited the great hall of St. George, the library, the state drawing rooms, the church, and the gardens at Windsor Castle.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/07/1836</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>Went to Astley's Amphitheatre.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/09/1836</td>
<td></td>
<td>Observed a diorama.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/13/1836</td>
<td></td>
<td>Visited Madame Tussaud's wax-works. Revisited the diorama. Visited Princess Victoria at the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/15/1836</td>
<td></td>
<td>Joined the freemasons.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/19/1836</td>
<td></td>
<td>Observed gun practice, rocket practice, mortar practice, and battering-train practice at Woolwich Royal Arsenal. Also, visited the storehouses, the laboratory, foundries, the cartridge-making department, and the soldiers' apartments.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/20/1836</td>
<td></td>
<td>Visited the Penitentiary, a prison, and a madhouse at Bedlam.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/21/1836</td>
<td></td>
<td>Met the Duke of Sussex in Kensington. Visited James South's &quot;Observatory House.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/22/1836</td>
<td></td>
<td>Visited the India-house, its museum, and its library.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event Description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/03/1836</td>
<td>Met King William IV in his palace. The exact location of this meeting is not clear in the texts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/05/1836</td>
<td>Were invited to Sir John Henry Willock's house. Willock was the former British ambassador to Iran.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/06/1836</td>
<td>Went to an opera.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/07/1836</td>
<td>Visited Hayleybury College.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/08/1836</td>
<td>Went to a Zoo.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/09/1836</td>
<td>Went to a flea circus.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>Went to Richmond and dined at Star and Garter.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>Attended the prorogation of the parliament</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/23/1836</td>
<td>Went to an opera-house.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/26/1836</td>
<td>Visited the stables in the Royal Mews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/28/1836</td>
<td>Visited a shipyard.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/30/1836</td>
<td>Visited the Secretary for Foreign Affairs in the Foreign Office.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/03/1836</td>
<td>Departure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sittingbourne</td>
<td>Dined and stayed at George Inn.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canterbury</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dover</td>
<td>Stayed at Ship Inn.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calais</td>
<td>Stayed at Monsieur Dessein's Hotel.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint-Omer</td>
<td>09/06/1836 Visited St. Michael and St. Gudula Cathedral as well as a hospital for the elderly. Visited the Palace of the Prince of Orange known as the Academy Palace.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bailleul</td>
<td>09/06/1836</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisle</td>
<td>09/07/1836</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enghien</td>
<td>09/07/1836</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brussels</td>
<td>09/08/1836</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tirlemont</td>
<td>09/09/1836</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint-Trond</td>
<td>09/10/1836</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liege</td>
<td>09/10/1836</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prussia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aix la Chapelle</td>
<td>09/10/1836</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juliers</td>
<td>09/11/1836</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cologne</td>
<td>09/11/1836</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonn</td>
<td>09/11/1836</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coblenz</td>
<td>09/12/1836</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Goar</td>
<td>09/12/1836</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayence</td>
<td>09/13/1836</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frankfurt</td>
<td>09/13/1836</td>
<td>Stayed at Hotel de Russie. Visited the museum of natural history as well as the statue of Ariadne. Participated in a party that the British minister held in his house.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bavaria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aschaffenburg</td>
<td>09/15/1836</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Würzburg</td>
<td>09/15/1836</td>
<td>Visited the palace of Würzburg Residence. Mentions a bridge and a castle.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuremberg</td>
<td>09/18/1836</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratisbon</td>
<td>09/20/1836</td>
<td>Visited the cathedral.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Straubing</td>
<td>09/15/1836</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vilshofen</td>
<td>09/16/1836</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fürstenzell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schärding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sigharting</td>
<td>09/21/1836</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eferding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengberg</td>
<td>09/23/1836</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melk</td>
<td>09/23/1836</td>
<td>Visited Melk Abbey.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perschling</td>
<td>09/23/1836</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vienna</td>
<td>09/24/1836</td>
<td>Stayed at Hôtel De Londres.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Went to the theater twice as well as the opera of Norna.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>09/28/1836</td>
<td>Visited Vienna arsenal.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>09/29/1836</td>
<td>Departure.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hochstraße</td>
<td>09/29/1836</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event/Comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pest</td>
<td>09/30/1836</td>
<td>Visited the city.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recskemét</td>
<td>10/01/1836</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiskunfélegyháza</td>
<td>10/02/1836</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Szatymaz</td>
<td>10/02/1836</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Szeged</td>
<td>10/03/1836</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comloșu</td>
<td>10/03/1836</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timișoara</td>
<td>10/05/1836</td>
<td>Mentions the fortifications.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lugoj</td>
<td>10/06/1836</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transylvania</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dobra</td>
<td>10/07/1836</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deva</td>
<td>10/07/1836</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sibiu (Hermannstadt)</td>
<td>10/08/1836</td>
<td>Stayed at Hotel Römischer Kaiser.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallachia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnu Roșu</td>
<td>10/10/1836</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Câinenii Mari</td>
<td>10/11/1836</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pitești</td>
<td>10/11/1836</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bucharest</td>
<td>10/12/1836</td>
<td>Arrival.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10/13/1836</td>
<td>Visited Alexandru D. Ghica, Prince of Wallachia,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>probably at the Ghika Tei Palace.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11/15/1836</td>
<td>Departure.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bălți</td>
<td>11/16/1836</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moldavia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galați</td>
<td>11/17/1836</td>
<td>Arrival.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12/03/1836</td>
<td>Departure.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ottoman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varna</td>
<td>12/05/1836</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeniköy</td>
<td>12/07/1836</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islanbul</td>
<td>01/27/1837</td>
<td>Stayed for a couple of days. Visited Hagia Sophia,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sultan Ahmed Mosque, and Süleymaniye Mosque.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>02/14/1837</td>
<td>Left Yeniköy to Baghdad.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX C

Aminoddowleh’s detailed itinerary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>Tehran</td>
<td>7/14/1856</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kan</td>
<td>7/19/1856</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Qazvin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kahak</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Khorram Deh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Soltaniyeh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zanjan</td>
<td>8/1/1856</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Torkaman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tabriz</td>
<td>8/11/1856</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(arrival)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tabriz</td>
<td>8/26/1856</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(departure)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Khoy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Por Abad</td>
<td>9/6/1856</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Avajiq</td>
<td>9/12/1856</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ottoman</td>
<td>Dizaj</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Padin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Üç Kilise</td>
<td>9/13/1856</td>
<td>Visited the ancient Armenian church.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Bagavan)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Karakilise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( Ağrı )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mollasüleyman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tahir</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yüzdaran</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hasankale</td>
<td></td>
<td>Visited the hot spring facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Pasinler)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Erzurum</td>
<td>9/21/1856</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(arrival)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Erzurum</td>
<td>9/27/1856</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(departure)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trabzon</td>
<td>9/27/1856</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(arrival)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trabzon</td>
<td>10/14/1856</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(departure)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Details</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samsun</td>
<td>10/15/1856</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Istanbul (arrival)</td>
<td>10/17/1856</td>
<td>Visited Sultan Abdülmejid I in the Dolmabahçe Palace located in the Beşiktaş.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Istanbul (departure)</td>
<td>12/22/1856</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Çanakkale</td>
<td>12/23/1856</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athens (arrival)</td>
<td>12/26/1856</td>
<td>Visited the Acropolis and the city.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athens (departure)</td>
<td>12/28/1856</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piraeus</td>
<td>12/26/1856</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mesina, Sicily</td>
<td>1/1/1857</td>
<td>Participated in the new year ceremonies in the city square. Took a tour of the city in a carriage.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naples</td>
<td>12/26/1856</td>
<td>Visited a museum, the ruins of Pompeii, as well as the city.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Messina, Sicily</td>
<td>1/1/1857</td>
<td>Visited military facilities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marseille</td>
<td>1/1/1857</td>
<td>Visited &quot;old and new places and buildings.&quot; Went to the theater and a zoo. Mentions the train station.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyon</td>
<td>1/18/1857</td>
<td>Mentions factories, hospitals, schools. Visited the city.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paris (arrival)</td>
<td>1/19/1857</td>
<td>Resided in a hotel in Avenue Montaigne. Visited Place du Carrousel, Palais des Tuileries, Palais du Louvre. Attended a ball held in Hôtel de Ville.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amiens</td>
<td>3/18/1857</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boulonge-sur-Mer</td>
<td>3/18/1857</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folkestone</td>
<td>3/18/1857</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London (arrival)</td>
<td>3/19/1857</td>
<td>Stayed in hotel Claridge's. Visited Queen Victoria in the Buckingham Palace. Visited the UK Parliament at</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Activity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>4/12/1857</td>
<td>Visited the Thames Tunnel. Attended a city council session. Visited a museum, botanical garden, a zoo, a circus, a club, and military facilities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>Paris</td>
<td>4/12/1857 Visited the chemical works, sulfuric acid production factory, mirror-polishing works, and metal foundries. Visited Château de Coucy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chauny</td>
<td>4/22/1857 Visited a mirror manufacturing company (probably Compagnie de Saint-Gobain).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Saint-Quentin</td>
<td>4/22/1857 Visited a mirror manufacturing company (probably Compagnie de Saint-Gobain).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paris</td>
<td>7/17/1857 Participated in the ceremony held for the Russian Tsar’s brother, Constantine, at Champ de Mars. Visited École Militaire and Saint Cyr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>Brussels</td>
<td>7/18/1857 Stayed in Hotel d'Europe. Visited king Leopold I (probably in Palais Royal de Bruxelles). Attended the princess's wedding (probably held at Château de Laeken). Went to the zoo.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Waterloo</td>
<td>Visited the site of Napoleon's battlefield.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brussels</td>
<td>7/18/1857 Visited the &quot;natural garden.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Antwerp</td>
<td>Toured the city. Visited the mint facility, and a military museum. Visited an arsenal and a weapons factory. Visited a castle and a zoo.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Liège</td>
<td>7/25/1857</td>
<td>Visited the arms factory, the coal mine, and the iron factory.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brussels (departure)</td>
<td>7/29/1857</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brussels</td>
<td>7/29/1857</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elbeuf</td>
<td>9/4/1857</td>
<td>Visited the factories (does not mention the specific industries).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rouen</td>
<td></td>
<td>Visited textile and cotton industries, spinning manufacturers, and chemical works. Went to the theater.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paris</td>
<td>9/6/1857</td>
<td>Visited textile and cotton industries, spinning manufacturers, and chemical works. Went to the theater.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paris (departure)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reims</td>
<td>11/3/1857</td>
<td>Visited a winery and a wool-combing factory. Visited a church (probably the Cathedral of Notre-Dame de Reims). Went to the theater. Visited a school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paris</td>
<td>12/19/1857</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boulonge-sur-Mer</td>
<td>12/19/1857</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folkestone</td>
<td>12/19/1857</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>12/20/1857</td>
<td>Stayed in hotel Claridge's. Visited a ship. Took a complete tour of Buckingham Palace. Went to at least two theaters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penge</td>
<td>12/24/1857</td>
<td>Visited the Crystal Palace.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portsmouth</td>
<td>1/2/1858</td>
<td>Visited the naval shipyard and took a tour of the navy facilities, factories, and stores. Visited a battleship and the royal ship.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglesey</td>
<td>1/5/1858</td>
<td>Visited a garden. Visited Menai suspension bridge and a slate mine.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manchester</td>
<td></td>
<td>Visited many factories including arms industry, cotton mill, train equipments, ship facility manufacturing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Activity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>Visited an asylum.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paris</td>
<td>Attended the parliament inauguration.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paris</td>
<td>1/31/1858 (departure)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culoz</td>
<td>2/1/1858</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lac de Bourget</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annecy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Jean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turin</td>
<td>Toured the city. Attended balls and theaters.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alessandria</td>
<td>Visited the Citadel of Alessandria.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genoa</td>
<td>Went to the theater.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livorno</td>
<td>Visited the Cisternone of Livorno. Visited a Jewish synagogue and a church.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civitavecchia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>Stayed in hotel Europa. Visited Piazza del Popolo, Saint Peter's Basilica and square, Castel Sant'Angelo and Bridge, capitol, and the Papal Palace in Vatican.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florence</td>
<td>Visited a fine church (probably Santa Maria del Fiore) and a royal palace. Mentions an anatomy house.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bologna</td>
<td>Observed the Towers of Bologna.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferrara</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Padova</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venice</td>
<td>Went to the theater. Visited a palace (probably Doge's Palace), a church (probably San Marco), a gallery (probably Galleria dell'Accademia) and a bridge.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trieste</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prussia</td>
<td>Visited the Schönbrunn Castle, a gallery (or maybe a museum which used to be a site for a horse riding festival), and a church (probably St. Stephen's Cathedral).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Details</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schoenbrunn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dresde</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berlin</td>
<td>Visited a palace (probably Stadtschloss), visited Sanssouci in Potsdam, and a church.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frankfurt</td>
<td>Mentions the building of the parliament, the national assembly (probably the Paulskirche), and the Frankfurt Cathedral.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strasbourg</td>
<td>Mentions the tower and the astronomical of Cathédrale Notre-Dame-de-Strasbourg.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paris</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyon</td>
<td>4/13/1858 Visited some factories including Silk Manufacturers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marseille</td>
<td>4/15/1858 Went to the theater.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ottoman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dardanelles</td>
<td>Mentions some castles.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Istanbul</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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APPENDIX E: Glossary

'Am (Omum) : Public

Abad : Thriving

Andaruni : Private zone of a building

Badgir : wind tower

Bagh : Garden

Behesht : Heaven

Biruni : Public zone of a building

Charbagh : Quadrilateral order of the Persian Garden

Entezam : Order

Enzebat : Discipline

Eyd : Islamic and Persian Feast

Farangestan (Farang) : West

Farangi : Westerner

Farsakh (Farsang) : Historical Iranian unit of itinerant distance comparable to the European league.

Hamvar : Even

Huri : Beautiful maidens who, as Islam teaches, attend the believers in the heaven

Kabutar-khaneh : Pigeon tower, used for collecting pigeon dung

Kharab : Ruined, Broken
Kucheh-bagh: A linear orchard aligned on the sides of an alleyway through the principles of char-bagh.

Mashruteh: The constitutional movement of 1906 in Iran

Me’jar: Baluster

Me’mar: Architect

Man: Historical Iranian unit of weight equal to 3 kilos

Minakari: Vitreous enamel

Monabbatkari: Wood carving

Nahamvar: uneven

Orosi: a large latticed window

Qanat: Subterranean water distribution system

Safarnameh: Travel diary

Santur: Iranian hammered dulcimer

Savad-e shahr: City scape, silhouette

Shah-Neshin: Literally meaning the king’s throne, Shah-neshin is the most important part of a space in Persian traditional buildings, designated for the guests or the elderly members of the family.

Shahi: Iran’s historic unit of currency

Shahr-e Farang: A peep show or a stereoscope that showed images of Farangestan cities

Soffeh: A semi-closed space in the architecture of Middle East, which is walled on three sides but open toward the garden.
T’ai al-ardh طي الأرض: A concept in Islamic texts that refers to traversing the earth without moving

Tafarrogjah تفرجگاه: Place of excursion

Tajaddod تجدد: The Iranian experience of modernity during the late 19th and early 20th century

Talar ثالار: A form of soffeh within a house, used during summer

Waqqf وقف: A concept in the Islamic regions that refers to endowment with religious intentions

Yakhchal يخچال: A structure that produces and store ice

Yenge donya ينگه دنیا: America

Zar’ ذرع: Cubit, a unit of length almost equal to a meter