

Original Research Article

Julfa, A Remnant of the Neighborhood Concept

Mohammadreza Sartipi Isfahani*

M.A. Student in Landscape Architecture, Faculty of Architecture, College of Fine Arts, University of Tehran, Tehran, Iran.

Negin Saghafian

M.A. Student in Interior Architecture, Soore University, Tehran, Iran.

Received: 14/10/2021

Accepted: 26/04/2022

Available online: 23/09/2022

Abstract | Julfa is one of the oldest neighborhoods in Isfahan, which was built to settle the Christians of Armenia on the south part of the Zayandehrood River during the Safavid period. Although its construction has undergone many changes, like the other parts of the city, it is one of the few neighborhoods that still carries the “neighborhood” prefix, and the citizens, as the city’s landscape audience, acknowledge it as “a neighborhood.” The question is, what factor (s) has made this region withstand the anarchist pressures of the perceived concepts of the modern imported urbanism, while the similar neighborhood of Juibareh has failed in this regard? Undoubtedly, various factors contribute to an area’s identification and its transformation into a neighborhood, but in the present study, we encounter a special minority neighborhood that, contrary to the views of many reputable sociologists and anthropologists, still has its former prosperity. By examining library resources, documents, field visits and using a landscape holistic approach, and also with the help of sociology and historical anthropology, we found that in this region a threat like being a minority has changed into an opportunity that causes solidarity and a sense of belonging to the neighborhood. (Which is also confirmed by experts). Comparing Juibareh neighborhood (formerly Judea) to another minority neighborhood of the same period in Isfahan shows that minority solidarity is not enough for a neighborhood and when power, wealth, and freedom of action come together with cultural factors provided by the government (from outside the group) and reinforce the help of this solidarity (from within the group), the neighborhood will be full of dynamism and progress. The present study seeks to investigate and analyze some of the most important factors of success in Julfa remaining a neighborhood compared to Juibareh and examines factors that may contribute to the prosperity and revitalization of the neighborhood concept.

Keywords | *Neighborhood, Landscape, Julfa neighborhood, Juibareh neighborhood, Isfahan, Minority, Solidarity.*

Introduction | The neighborhood is a word that has faded from memories, slowly through time, and is a worthy concept that we have inherited from our ancestors. However, it has been sold too cheap in exchange for modern urban planning. After years of experiencing modernism, now people have realized its shortcomings and have tried to strengthen and revive the concept of “neighborhood”. However, in this blind imitation, rare neighborhoods have survived the fundamental changes and preserved themselves. An example is Julfa neighborhood in Isfahan. Although the external cover of the neighborhood and its components have changed many times, as the changing

cells of the human body, its unit nature as a neighborhood is still somewhat understandable. On the other hand, we have Juibareh, another city minority neighborhood, and also the other majority neighborhoods, that have lost this blessing. Why does the Julfa neighborhood remain a neighborhood, and people still call it a neighborhood (recognize Julfa as a neighborhood)? And how has this potential become practical and, in comparison with other neighborhoods of Isfahan, has it adapted well to the existing conditions? Why is a similar neighborhood (in terms of minority conditions), is not the same as Juibareh? Using historical anthropology, one can explore history to reveal the roots and characteristics of Julfa and

*Corresponding author: +989392258145, Mohammad.sartipi@ut.ac.ir

Juibareh neighborhoods. Now it is time to summarize what has been said to reach some of the most important components of the invulnerable characters of Julfa, which might be able to help us in reviving and organizing the contemporary city's neighborhoods. In the meantime, we should mention some of the pests that have weakened the neighborhood, the implicit prosperity, or its false perception. Harm has been caused by incompetence, poor planning, or a lack of a thorough understanding of the neighborhood. In many studies of similar areas, the analysis and presentation of solutions are limited to purely physical factor arrangements. Therefore, in the present text, the purpose is to introduce the landscape as a holistic approach, which helps us to reach a complete understanding, and as the landscape has both objective and subjective aspects, we focus more on a subjective concept that is being less mentioned by the researchers.

Research Questions

Which factors have made the Julfa neighborhood stay somewhat unchanged compared to most other neighborhoods in the city, after passing years and undergoing major urban changes? What are the roots and causes of this component or components? Have these components remained constant throughout history or have we witnessed changes? Did other similar neighborhoods, such as Juibareh, have such blessings?

Research Method

Because the Julfa neighborhood is continuing its life, it can be studied not only in the past but also in present. For this purpose, library documents and resources were used to study the roots and history of the neighborhood, and for the present research, field studies were conducted. The dominant research approach was the landscape holistic approach. In addition, some opinions of sociological and historical anthropologists were used, which was possible through qualitative research methods and data analysis. (By qualitative research, we mean any kind of research that produces findings that have not been obtained by statistical operations or other counting methods. [...]). The major part of the analysis in qualitative research is interpretive" (Strauss & Carbin, 2020, 32). The qualitative method is used to discover areas of life that we do not know or know a lot about yet need a new understanding of (ibid.) Therefore, this study distributed a questionnaire among the residents of the city as its audience, seeking the answers to the following questions: "Do you recognize Julfa as a neighborhood?" And "What factors are involved in this opinion?" Because the urban landscape is the citizens' perception of the city, the questionnaire was randomly distributed among fifty citizens, and the results were reflected in the text.

Research Background

Due to its antiquity and especially the dynamism of Julfa, this neighborhood is a great example of small-scale urban life that can be considered by many specialties. The traditional character of neighborhoods, preservation, lively life of neighborhood residents (which unfortunately is declining due to migration and commercialization). The presence of citizens from other areas of the city in shops spending leisure time, cafes, the existence of preserved historical texture, attracting domestic and foreign tourists to visit the neighborhood and its historical monuments, the existence of art schools in parts of the neighborhood and surrounding areas and the presence of students to research, capture and sketch the neighborhood, the existence of various and attractive shops for the audience and many other reasons. All leads to studying this neighborhood as a potential for various groups such as architects, urban planners, painters, photographers, sociologists, and anthropologists from academic groups; Tourists and guides, citizens for shopping, visiting or entertainment, and other non-university groups. Therefore, the traces of Julfa can be found in the works of many people, but here we will introduce a limited number of those sources briefly.

One of the best examples of the sociological study of Julfa as a minority neighborhood is the essay entitled "Historical sociology of the position and function of religious minorities in the city of Isfahan in the Safavid period" (Jafari, 2012). If we want to study the Safavid era historically, it is necessary to refer to the writings of tourists or historians and writers such as Jabri Ansari, Kempfer, Chardin, Darhohian, and others who describe the situation of Christians and Julfa neighborhood in the Safavid period. Studies have also focused on the Abrahamic religions of Iran and their effects on architecture and urban planning. An example of such studies is the article entitled "Meaning of urban space between Muslims and Jews" by Ghalehnoee, Salehnia, and Peymanfar (2016) and "The effect of jurisprudential standards on the formation of architecture and residential neighborhoods of the Jewish and Christian minorities in Isfahan at Safavid" period by Karimian and Nikzad (2012). Sociological and anthropological-historical sources also help us better understand the concepts and their relationships and roots. The "Sociology" book by Anthony Giddens (2011), the "Urban Anthropology" book by Fakouhi (2007), the "Anthropology" book by Auge and Cullen (2019), "Iran Between Two Revolutions" book by Abrahamian (2010), are valuable books that address different sociological concepts and Anthropology. Other streams of studies exist on architecture, landscape architecture, and urban planning and have focused on basic issues such as urban organization, neighborhoods, and neighborhoods. As an example, we can refer to the article of re-reading the constructive components of the space city organization of the post-Islamic Iranian city,

which is written by Abarghouei Fard and Mansouri (2021), and pointed to “New Neighborhood; Urban Sociology Pattern from Neighborhood Development” by Mousavi (2012). There have been many similar neighborhoods throughout the history of the planet whose minority aspects can be the basis of the studies. In the first category, there are a lot of studies that have analyzed the Jewish community during the siege and persecution of World War II and after that and their resettlement in Germany, which during the war was full of tension and then sometimes continued by extremist factions. In this regard, we can refer to the writings of, DW news site (Hm/af (kna), 2020), and the book “The Emergence of Jewish Ghettos During the Holocaust” by Dan Michman (2013). Second category studies suggest the creation of associations to combat minority discrimination and create greater solidarity (a practical manifestation of popular methods¹) was established in various countries, including Germany, after the world wars and is still active. (Such as the “German Jewish Council”, the “World Jewish Congress” or the “House of Religions”) which can be referred to as the studies of “Nadie Fazl, DW news site” (Fazl, 2021) (However, this group of studies emphasizes more sociological and political aspects and is beyond our discussion and urban issues). When it comes to national minorities in other countries, the “Chinese neighborhood” will undoubtedly be very prominent. One of the most important of these neighborhoods is located in the United States. The internal cohesion in these minority urban units is evident from its continuity over the years. The presentation of a particular culture among the dominant American cultures, as elsewhere in the world, carries sensitivities that can be traced to the overt and covert opposition of American films, stories, and news. The Chinese Quarter can be considered a social exclusion that is although initially associated with humiliating concepts and poverty, now has become as important as an important urban member and the potential for tourism and capital production (Loo, Tong & True, 1989; Santos, Belhassen & Caton, 2008). Another category of similar studies is racial minorities, which are distinguished from the majority by factors such as culture, customs, or skin color. A well-known example is the plight of Native Americans or the blacks over the years of struggling with whites has resulted in Unhealthy, criminal, and poor conditions in the black neighborhoods (Choy Wong, 1977; Wacquant, 1993; Mitchel & Dell, 1992).

In the end, it can be said that the Jolfa neighborhood of Isfahan, which is at the same time a neighborhood that includes the Christian religious minority and the Armenian national minority, is similar to the mentioned global examples in terms of features. The mentioned studies have dealt with the issue of minorities and minority areas in different ways, but this study attempts to use them to examine the influence of the potential features within minority groups and its

synthesis with external components such as government support, capital allocation, granting freedom of action, etc on the preservation and reinforcement of its minority characteristics and conclude that how a neighborhood still retains itself as a “neighborhood”. This is only ensured by the cohesion within the group resulting from being a minority.

Theoretical Foundations

• City, neighborhood, landscape

For years, man has realized that has to connect with other people of his kind and build vital relationships by creating social connections (although some believe that basic needs can be met without forming a community, most human meanings form in group life “Man thinks only collectively about himself. All human thought is social [...]” (Auge & Cullen, 2019, 24). “The city is the highest product of human civilization” (Mansouri, 2018), which is one of the most important platforms for the formation of society. The city itself is composed of puzzle-like pieces that are not only placed next to each other but are interconnected with each other. These pieces are small units of landscapes called “neighborhoods” and such an approach (neighborhoodism) is the result of a systemic attitude toward the city (Abarghouei Fard & Mansouri, 2021). Neighborhoods were built layer by layer at the time of their creation and throughout their life history like the levels of a wall, and if these layers, which are the elements of its landscape, do not continue in time, neighborhoods will be destroyed and citizens living in it as guardians and Its users are responsible for maintaining the neighborhood.

The expansion of cities always complicates not only providing service to far places from the center but also more importantly the meaning of different places. The small communities referred to as neighborhoods (one of the urban small units types) make their residents’ lives meaningful in relation to the smaller communities located in the heart of the city’s larger community. These small units are themselves the main factor in the gradual development and growth of cities (ibid., 26). Tavassoli considers the neighborhoods (which are created based on social, economic, and cultural similarities) as an important factor in creating the socio-spatial order of cities and a kind of small-scale monopolies in the city (ibid.). The importance of small urban units, especially neighborhoods, is so great that this element, in a two-way relationship with the urban space organization, is very decisive in creating a general called “city” and its absence makes it very difficult to think of the city as a whole. “The spatial organization of the city is the order resulting from the revealing of the citizens’ mentality in their living space or the order between the role of the elements that introduce the city as a whole and a system” (Abarghouei Fard & Mansouri, 2020). Among the components of urban space organization, small units (which are the neighborhoods here) have a social

origin, so not only their physical aspect but also their social and mental aspects are very important (*ibid.*, 24). Among the various influential approaches used in urban issues, an approach is needed that examines the body alongside the meaning and in this regard will be equipped with a systematic and holistic sight. “An attitude in which urban planning and urban management can no longer focus only on physical issues, and in fact matters of social, economic, cultural, environmental, and especially the mental and physical health of citizens have become more important than physical and hardware matters» (*Barati, 2012*). But in the urban planning that governs our country, with an imitative and incomplete perception of the primary methods of modernism (which has lost its validity in its productive countries and its shortcomings have led to reconsideration and attention to new approaches such as neighborhoodism²) neighborhood’s structure and organization are broken in the grip of principles called Zoning, which in turn causes alienation and passivity of citizens (*ibid.*). At the same time, new approaches employed in urban design have shifted to neighborhoodism.³

Norberg-Schulz sees the landscape as the context in which the combinations of existential space and bodies [landscape] will emerge. Describing this context, he states, “In general, the landscape has a certain capacity [...] This capacity depends both on the physical-practical situation and the meanings that imply the forms of the landscape.” (*Norberg-Schulz, 2019, 541*). Shahcheraghi and Bandarabad (*2017, 433*) also consider the urban landscape to include not only different natural and artificial physical layers but also cultural and behavioral layers of citizens, which is the other reason for Holistic nature of this field.

Various factors are effective in the formation and survival of urban neighborhoods as one example of “the landscape”, but this text only deals with the component that is more common among people with common characteristics, such as religious minorities, and that is “solidarity between individuals.” The great French sociologist Emile Durkheim writes in this regard: “Social cohesion [...] is [something] that sustains society and protects it from falling to the bottom of turmoil [...]. Cohesion is formed when individuals successfully integrate into social groups [such as neighborhoods] and are guided and adjusted by a set of shared values and customs” (*Giddens, 2011, 751*). Given that the purpose of this study is to investigate the impact of the concept of minorities on the concept of neighborhoods in this section, only a brief definition of the concept of neighborhood is Given. The landscape approach seems a good option for analyzing urban neighborhoods as part of it, which will be introduced in more detail later in the discussion of the neighborhood.

• Minorities and their general conditions

Giddens defines a “minority” as a group of people in a society who find themselves, due to their cultural or physical

characteristics, in an unequal position compared to other people in that society (*ibid.*, 805) and if these inequalities become structured, they are “stratified” (*ibid.*, 238). In his view, the distinction between certain ethnicities and those of others, especially if they are a minority in number, is rarely neutral and often accompanied by inequalities in power, wealth, welfare, and social facilities, and often is along with violence and harassment (*ibid.*, 278). For example, we can refer to the nearly 2,000-year history of the persecution of Christian Europe by the Jews, the most obvious of which is the genocide of the Nazi German government during World War II. Another example is the fact that blacks or Native Americans are discriminated against by the whites, which has been accompanied by years of discrimination, violence, and inequality and is still seen to some extent. These discriminations are usually accompanied by the social exclusion of these groups. Anthony Giddens, through a sociological study of minorities, has identified the following characteristics of these groups as follows:

1) Unfavorable living conditions (as a result of discrimination by others), 2) Sense of belonging, solidarity, loyalty, and shared interests within the group (often willing to see themselves as a separate group from others (us and them)) and 3) Segregation from other groups in the city through the use of fences and walls, housing in isolated neighborhoods, intermarriage, and sometimes differences in using facilities (such as the use of separate train wagons for blacks in the United States, or the installation of a special sign or clothing for Jews during World War II (by Nazi order) (*ibid.*, 279) (by the order of the Nazis). Minority groups are usually settled in urban areas called “ghettos”⁴ This term is called “Judaism” in Islamic countries. In its later meaning, it refers not only to Jewish areas but also to areas with populations with specific cultural, racial, religious, ethnic, etc. characteristics (such as black ghettos or Chinese neighborhoods in the United States). Ghettos are usually associated with the concept of poverty and socio-economic inequalities (*Fakouhi, 2017, 296*) (although there are exceptions, like Julfa). The low-quality characters in most ghettos, which result from inequality and organized discrimination, have a profound effect on the people living there. Due to the upstream support and cultural acceptance of the majority of the city, the prosperity of the ghettos and the high quality of life in them have a profound effect on the development of inhabitants and their prosperity. As Dan Wichman writes, “We are what the ghetto made us.” Continuing to express its impact on its inhabitants in the form of their feelings, he states, “Children remember it [ghetto] with fear and adults with humiliation” (*Michman, 2013*).

• History of Julfa and Armenians of Isfahan

During the Safavid rule and the choice of Isfahan, various Christians lived in this city, which can generally be divided into two groups: “Georgian Christians” and “European

Christians.” The first group was Christians who came to Isfahan province from Georgia and settled in Isfahan and surrounding cities such as Frieden. The second group consisted of merchants, religious missionaries, tourists, politicians, and representatives of the European states who had entered the capital of the Iranian government. These two groups of Christians lived and worked in different parts of the city, and, due to their minority and incoherence within their group, had the least social impact on the city.

During the conflicts between the Safavid government and the Ottoman government, the areas close to the border fronts of the two governments suffered a lot of damage, one of which was located in the Caucasus. The people of Julfa in Armenia were highly exposed to the encroachments of the Ottoman government. Shah Abbasi decided to force the people of this region to move into the country and put them in a safe place. For this reason, the word “forced migration” is used here, and the people of this region had no choice but to leave their homeland. However, as will be mentioned below, this migration also brought benefits to the Safavid government. In 1013 AH (1612 AD), Armenians entered Iran from Julfa, but from this population, due to famine and unfavorable weather conditions, only 5% reached Isfahan safely (Jafari, 2012, 7). But the question is how these people will build a prosperous neighborhood in the future. As it is written in the writings of various tourists and travelers, “They built such luxurious houses and painted them with gold and azure that dazzled the eyes of every viewer.” And they also built churches, miracle-like, worthy of the glory of God... “ (Darohanian, quoted by Jafari, 2012, 10).

History of Isfahan Juibareh and Jews

Following Cyrus the Achaemenid’s defeat of Babylon around 2,500 years ago, some migrated to Jerusalem and others to Iran. The presence of Jews in Isfahan dates back to the same period. They built an area that was later called Judea, and “as it appears from the writings of ancient geographers, the present-day Isfahan is built on the ruins of the same ancient Jie and later Judea [...]” (Mostafavi, quoted by Sangtrash and Pourmand, 11, 200). This neighborhood was called Joubareh (Joybareh) in the fifth century AH and is still called the same. This neighborhood, which is located in the old part of the city, flourished until the Safavid government in the tenth century AH moved the city center from the old square (located in the old part and near the river) to its newly established square, Naqsh Jahan, but after that, the importance of this neighborhood decreased (Karimian & Nikzad, 2012, 202). Considering the common features of Jolfa and Juibareh neighborhoods (being a minority, coexistence, and the same origin), we briefly reviewed the history of these neighborhoods and intend to compare them to explore the reason for the neighborhood concept’s continuity or non-continuity in each of them.

Discussion

After the Armenians entered the city of Isfahan, Shah Abbas I allocated the royal lands of the south Zayandehrood (separated from the Muslim settlements) for the construction of a new Armenian settlement, and the inhabitants named it Jolfa in memory of their place of residence. Chardin attributed the reason for this separation, and somehow this social barrier, to controlling their relations and behavior and separating Muslim people from them (Chardin quoted by Jafari, 2012, 13). Although there was no ban on travel and association, Muslims were prevented from settling in the Jolfa area. The important point is that, contrary to Giddens’s theory that the majority of minorities face discrimination and inequality, the Safavid government treated the Armenians peacefully and even granted them considerable freedoms, in a way that Daruhanians described the small town of Julfa as an autonomous republic (Jafari, 2012, 14). or Abrahamian writes about the Christians of Iran, “The majority of Muslims were peasants, tribal people, and market people, [while] many Christians were salesmen, specialists, skilled craftsmen, and urban wage earners...” (Abrahamian, 2010,475). Even with this freedom of action and the financial and commercial support of the government, it was such that, in some cases, the trade of some items was monopolized by Christians, and some Christian merchants had a stronger position than Muslim merchants (Jafari, 2012, 18).

Various reasons have been cited for strengthening Armenian immigrant Christians, one of the most important of which has been the strengthening of Armenian Christian trade relations with European Christians. Although this does not seem to be the main reason for their migration, the issue of the economy and trade is one of the most important social maps of Armenians in Safavid Isfahan (ibid.). The reasons given by Ali Akbar Jafari as the Armenian winner for conquering the commercial market include familiarity with foreign languages (European languages), familiarity with European trade relations, extensive communication networks of Armenians, and common religion (which lead to better travel, accommodation, and trade with their European counterparts), and the low costs of Armenians in travel and trade (ibid., 20). The analysis of the study and the comparison of the characteristics of Jolfa and Juibareh neighborhoods throughout history have caused these two neighborhoods to have different personalities, as presented in the Table 1.

The landscape is the product of the modern world and the non-Cartesian perspective. It is also a synthesis of objectivity and subjectivity about the fact that after combining these two components, a new being is formed that is neither the Objectivity nor the subjectivity, it is both objectivity and subjectivity (Mansouri & Farzin, 2020, 19). Therefore, it is necessary to deal with both components of the landscape to fully understand these phenomena, but a separate study on

Table 1. Comparison of effective factors on the difference between Julfa and Juibara neighborhoods in Isfahan. Source: Authors.

Julfa neighborhood (Christian minority)	Juibareh neighborhood (Jewish minority)	Description
No population mixing	Mixing Jews with Muslims	Muslims did not have the right to live in the Julfa neighborhood, while the Juibareh neighborhood has long had Muslim residents. This helps maintain the demographic integrity and solidarity of Julfa.
Town (neighborhood) outside the city	In the heart of Muslim neighborhoods	Julfa was an out-of-town neighborhood, so it had much less adherence to the Islamic city, while the Juibareh was very much influenced by the conditions and changes of the Islamic city.
Economic, social, political support of the government	Good and bad government treatment of Jews	Although Christians have been oppressed by the central government at times, they have also often been supported by governments. The most significant era is the Safavid period (especially the beginning of the Safavid period) when land and capital were given to them for trade. On the other hand, there are limited periods in which the central government's relations with the Jews were favorable, even though they held high positions in government. As a result, the positive actions of governments often included Christians.
Religious and urban planning freedom	Presence in the Supervised part of the Islamic city	Christianity is a more open religion than Judaism, and this is very effective now, especially in establishing proper communication between Muslim citizens and them, (such as the freedom of church attendance for the non-Christian public). However, a very basic point that Karimian and Nikzad (2012) point out well is the difference between the construction of the Julfa neighborhood outside the Islamic city and the presence of the Juibareh neighborhood inside the Islamic city ⁵ . This forces the Jews to comply with the requirements of Supervised urban planning if the Armenians were free to build.

each of them is a technical error that our today's cities are struggling with (such as paying attention only to objective and Physically issues). like the way limiting urban management actions to physical arrangements and hardware, Influences on the process of the inability of cities and neighborhoods to meet their needs and social roles and the decline and ultimately the resolution of neighborhoods in the primary concepts of the city (Abarghouei Fard et al.,2020, 23). Julfa and Juibareh neighborhoods have both been studied in a single city (Isfahan) and at the same time (time of writing of this text (1400 AH)) and with the characteristics of a minority unit. Analysis of questionnaires filled out by citizens shows Julfa is perceived as a neighborhood, while Juibareh, was largely regarded as a neighborhood. Citizens' answer to the question of 'why Julfa is known as a neighborhood' was a combination of mental-socio-cultural characteristics and physical elements that symbolize and represent the Christian religion of the residents in this neighborhood (language and conversations of residents with different languages, holidays, celebrations, and Residents' special ceremonies, names of buildings, passages, and shops, decorations of buildings and shops, churches, bell towers, crosses, symbols and language of the residents of the neighborhood) and other elements were the hallmarks of Julfa from other places in the minds of the audience. This is even though the building of Jewish synagogues, writings, and signs specific to this religion can also be seen in the neighborhood of Juibareh, and if only the

physical aspect of Julfa had caused its continuation, Juibareh should have experienced this too, but as we see this did not happen. Therefore, the existence of religious elements and the appearance of the buildings of these two minorities (physical aspect) is not the only effective factor in the survival of the Julfa neighborhood and we should also look for factors in the mental-social aspects that have accompanied the continuity of the neighborhood with objective factors. It is important to mention two basic points in this regard that will require future studies. First, despite the explanations given, not only the inhabitants of the Jewish minority in Juibareh but also the Christian inhabitants of Julfa have greatly decreased and mostly migrated out of Iran, so the minority population is shrinking and being replaced by the people with the religious majority in the city. The second point is the feeling of danger regarding the preservation and restoration of the urban texture of the Julfa neighborhood, which is like a double-edged sword; On the one hand, the preservation and restoration of texture and buildings are vital, on the other hand, the risk of the texture becoming a museum and the migration of residents - who are life-giving to neighborhood -to out of the texture and replacing residential units with shops, cafes, and restaurants to create attractive texture and production of various economic capitals. Because the dynamism and life of neighborhoods depend on the presence of their inhabitants. Therefore, the prosperity of the Julfa neighborhood, apart from the factors

mentioned above, can be caused by economic development and income generation programs (preserving the texture and neighborhood of Jolfa to attract tourists or customers of shops and Foodstuffs) both at the macro-level of urban management and micro-level (property owners and shops)) which in this case the concept of the neighborhood will be false. Therefore, it can be concluded that urban management and economic-political arrangements can, along with other physical and socio-cultural factors, support the concept of neighborhood, which is described in detail above.

Conclusion

After the cave-dwelling period, men turned to monogamy and social living. people settled in different parts of the city at different times according to kinship, race, ethnicity, tribe, religion, and in later cases according to socioeconomic status or even occupation and profession and other types of groupings and owned neighborhoods in it. The neighborhood was a valuable division that left a legacy of the past, and after a period of turning its back on it, men seek to renew it now. Jolfa neighborhood of Isfahan was built to accommodate Christian Armenians during the Safavid period and has shown its compatibility with outside changes as much as possible throughout history. While the

Juibareh Jewish area has shrunk over time, and largely lost its neighborhood identity. The present study, comparing these two minority neighborhoods in Isfahan, concluded that the solidarity of Julfa Christians is not the only factor in the continuation of the Julfa neighborhood, and although the hypothesis is based on the statement that “minorities can maintain their neighborhoods with their inherent solidarity” is true. but this factor is not enough. Table 2 shows some of the factors influencing the continuity of the concept of the “Jolfa neighborhood” over time as a result of research. Although some of these factors are no longer effective in the contemporary era, these primary components during the Safavid rule changed and strengthened the secondary components throughout history, which to some extent ensures the pressure of new urbanism changes. In this article, several components affecting the life of the Jolfa neighborhood were mentioned, but as we know, the urban landscape is very complex and includes many layers, so the mentioned components are not the only vital factors, and continuing this path will require more research from different aspects. Here we can see the power of government systems as the custodian of the city and the need for an appropriate planning and management system in creating, maintaining, reviving, and strengthening urban neighborhoods.

Table 2. Some of the most important reasons for maintaining the identity of the Julfa neighborhood of Isfahan until now. Source: Authors.

Period	The reason for the continuation of the neighborhood's identity	Description
The past (primary components: Safavid time)	Solidarity of Armenian Christians [†]	One of the most important reasons is that due to the minority of Armenian Christians against the Muslim majority in the city, the sense of solidarity of the Christian inhabitants of Julfa as a “popular method” has Resisted as a defensive factor against foreign forces and stopped fundamental changes (which destroyed the other neighborhoods Easily).
	Government support ^{**}	Certainly, the support of the Safavid government had a great impact on this growing trend, especially if we compare this group with Georgian or European Christians living in Isfahan or even other minorities such as the Jews of Juibareh neighborhood, we find that government support was the factor that other minority groups did not have and This made this huge difference.
Present (secondary components: present tense)	Solidarity of Armenian Christians [†]	Although mixing habitation of Christians and Muslims is taking place, the majority of the neighborhood is still Christian and has maintained its solidarity. (Preservation and continuation of Christian monuments and signs in the neighborhood)
	The wealth of the inhabitants ^{**}	Due to the considerable prosperity of Jolfa and the people of this region's commerce, the inhabitants have been somehow rich and powerful, which makes them able to cope with changes.
	Collective will	The prosperity of the neighborhood has made Jolfa have an attractive and prosperous living for citizens of other parts of the city and even domestic and foreign visitors from a long time ago. The connection of Armenians ⁶ with Europe and the trade has always made the imported European culture and also their wealth causes the creation of houses and shops different from the Iranian culture and the imported forms are attractive to the inhabitants of the city. This makes the Jolfa-loving people force able to resist destruction.

**/*Items marked with similar asterisks are factors that have evolved from the past to the present over time, and in a way, present factors are the result of this evolution of past factors into the present.

Endnote

1. Folk methods: "Folk methods are processes that members of a particular community use to produce their own world and to recognize and be close to it." (Auge & Cullen, 41, 2019).
2. "One of the persuasive forces in support of modern art, and especially modernism in architecture, has been the deliberate impulse to break traditional forms [including the concept of the neighborhood] [...] which has led to the disintegration of landscapes, both in cities and in the suburbs." (Berque, 2018, 75) but modernism fails to solve this crisis and introduces it as a landscape killer (ibid: 81). It is important to note that the proponents of this intentional motive identify "backward people" who follow the ideas of modernist theorists (ibid.: 75) and such an expression expresses a change in attitude towards the theories of modernism.
3. Refer to the article of "Sustainable City; The strategies of achieving sustainable neighborhood" Written by (Karimi Moshaver & Negin Taji, 2012).
4. The word ghetto (Gietto) comes from Italian roots and dates back to the Jewish region of Venice, Italy in 1516.
5. The law of living under supervision (Jizyah) [was] legislated with the revelation of verse 299 of Surah Tawbah and the Jewish, Christian and Zoroastrian minorities were able to live in Islamic lands by accepting this agreement." (Amid Zanjani, quoted by Karimian & Nikzad, 2012, 194). According to this agreement, the minorities of the Abrahamic religions present in the Islamic land are obliged to observe the principles in their urban planning. For example, the height of the buildings of these religions should not be higher than the buildings adjacent to the Muslims (the reason for that the passage of the Jewish buildings in the Juibareh of Isfahan) or at the entrance of the buildings should be opened into a dead end or side alley and such principles.
6. Armenians are not the only residents of Julfa in Isfahan, but by the order of Shah Abbas II Safavid in 1640 AD, all Christians in the city of Isfahan were transferred to this neighborhood; However, because the seeds of Julfa were planted for the settlement of Armenians and they constitute the majority of Christians in Isfahan, the word "Armenians or Armenians" is used in the text to mention the names of the inhabitants of Julfa.

Reference list

- Abarghouei Fard, H., Borumand, H., Tayefe Hosseinlou, A., Latifi, M. M., Nabaei, S. Y. & Nikzad, Gh. (2020). Collective space, a declining concept, Assessing the Social Quality of Urban Spaces in Historic District of Gorgan. *Journal of Art & Civilization of the Orient*, 8(28), 23-32.
- Abarghouei Fard, H. & Mansouri, S.A. (2021). Reviewing the Constituent Components of the Spatial Organization of Iranian City after Islam in the 9th–14th AH Travelogues. *MANZAR*, 13(55), 20-29.
- Abrahamian, Y. (2010). *Iran between two revolutions* (A. Gholmohammadi, M. I. Fattahi, Trans.). Tehran: Ney.
- Auge, M. & Cullen, J. (2019). *L'anthropologie* [Anthropology] (N. Fakouhi, Trans.). Tehran: Ney.
- Barati, N. (2012). Neighborhoodism in Tehran: A step toward the humanistic city. *MANZAR*, 4(18), 66.
- Berque, A. (2018). *Pensee paysagere* [Thinking through the landscape] (A. Asadpour, Trans.). Mashhad: Kasra.
- Choy Wong, Ch. (1977). Black and Chinese Grocery Stores in Los Angeles' Black Ghetto. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, 5(4), 439.
- Fakouhi, N. (2017). *Ensanshenasi-ye shahri* [Urban anthropology]. Tehran: Ney.
- Ghalehnoee, M., Salehinia, M. & Peymanfar, S. (2017). Meaning of Urban Space between Muslims and Jews. *Armanshahr*, 9(17), 273-284.
- Giddens, A. (2011). *Sociology* (M Sabouri, Trans.). Tehran: Ney.
- Jafari, A. (2012). The Sociology of Position and Performance of Religious Minorities in Isfahan during Safavid Period (Case Study: Isfahan Julfa Armenians). *Socio Economic History Studies*, 1(1), 1-23.
- Karimian, H. & Nikzad, M. (2012). The effect on the Jurisprudence standards for architectural and residential neighborhoods in the two minorities of Jews and Christians in Safavid Isfahan. *Journal of Historical Sociology*, 4(2), 193-224.
- Karimi mOshaver, M. & Negin Taji, S. (2012). Sustainable City; The strategies of achieving sustainable neighborhood. *MANZAR*, 4(18), 74-79.
- Loo, Ch., Tong, B. & True, R. (1989). A bitter bean: Mental health status and attitudes in Chinatown. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 17(4), 283-296.
- Mansouri, S.A. (2018). The Folk Visage of the City. *MANZAR*, 10(44), 3.
- Mansouri, S.A. & Farzin, A. (2020). *City planning, Design, Methodology*. Tehran: Nazar Research Center.
- Mitchell, S.L. & Dell, D.M. (1992). The relationship between Black students' racial identity attitude and participation in campus organizations. *Journal of College Student Development*, 33(1), 39-43.
- Michman, D. (2013). *The Emergence of Jewish Ghettos during the Holocaust*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sangtarash, F. & Pourmand, H.A. (2020). Jewish Thoughts on the Establishment of the Synagogue (Case Study: Joyabareh District in Isfahan). *Journal of Art & Civilization of the Orient*, 7(26), 5-20.
- Santos, C.A., Belhassen, Y. & Catona, K. (2008). Reimagining Chinatown: An analysis of tourism discourse. *Tourism Management*, 29(5), 1002-1012.
- Shahcheraghi, A. & Bandarabad, A. (2017). *Environed in Environment*. Tehran: ACER.
- Strauss, A. & Carbin, J. (2009). *Basics of qualitative research : grounded theory procedures and techniques* (I. Afshar, Trans.). Tehran: Ney.
- Mousavi, S. Y. (2012). New Neighborhood; Urban Sociology Pattern from Neighborhood Development. *MANZAR*, 4(18), 67-73.
- Norberg-Schulz, Ch. (2019). *Meaning in Western Architecture* (M. Qayyumi Bidhendi, Trans.). Tehran: Matn.
- Fazl, N. (2021). *Zendegie yahoodian dar alman pas az holocaust* [Jewish life in post-Holocaust Germany]. Retrieved October 2021, 12 from: <https://p.dw.com/p/3pbic>.
- Hm/af(kna). (2020). *Khane haye vahede mazhabi* [Religious unit houses]. Retrieved April 9, 2021, from: <https://p.dw.com/p/3mDps>.
- Wacquant, L.J.D. (1993). Urban Outcasts: Stigma and Division in the Black American Ghetto and the French Urban Periphery. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 17(3), 366-383.

COPYRIGHTS

Copyright for this article is retained by the authors with publication rights granted to Manzar journal. This is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).



HOW TO CITE THIS ARTICLE

Sartipi Isfahani, M. & Saghafian, N. (2022). Julfa, A Remnant of the Neighborhood Concept. *MANZAR*, 14(60), 50-57.

DOI: 10.22034/MANZAR.2022.310354.2159

URL: http://www.manzar-sj.com/article_149836_en.html

