

In the Beginning, Middle, and End There Was a Garden: Bahram Sadeqi's *Malakut*

Kareem Lowaymi Mutlaq¹ & Seyyed Mehdi Mousavi²

¹Corresponding author, Shahid Chamran University of Ahvaz, klmutlaq@scu.ac.ir

²Shahid Chamran University of Ahvaz, mousavismehdi@yahoo.com

Received: 07/04/2014

Accepted: 15/09/2014

Abstract

It seems impossible to think of the Persian art without mentioning the significant presence of gardens. They are present in miniature painting, architecture, and literature. One of the modern works of Persian fiction in which gardens play a significant role is *Malakut* (1961), a novella by the modern Iranian fiction writer Bahram Sadeqi (1936-1984). The story of this novella begins in a "green garden" in "that pleasant moonlit night," and moves through seductions in a garden of sin and death; it ends abruptly around dawn the next morning on the outskirts of the first garden with most of the characters either dead or dying. Moreover, there is a third garden which forces its presence upon the consciousness of the text whenever possible. Under the influence of his studies in Freudian psychoanalysis in writing *Malakut*, Sadeqi (1961) seems to have given gardens new meanings. In the present study, thus, the significance of the gardens in *Malakut* is studied in the light of Brooks's rereading of Freud's *Beyond the Pleasure Principle* (1961) as a text concerning textuality in which instead of studying the author's, reader's, or character's unconsciousness, Brooks considers narrative as an organism which, like human life, is shaped and governed by the drives. Accordingly, we argue that the 3 gardens which make up the setting of the plot of the novella, indeed, represent, respectively, life and death drives, and the return of the repressed garden.

Keywords: *Malakut*; Garden; Life and Death Drives; Repetition and Return

1. Introduction

Gardens are significant in the life of the Iranians and their art. In the Persian literature, from the works of classical poets such as Attar, Rumi, Nezami, Sa'di and Hafiz to modern fiction including the stories of Sadeq Hedayat (1903-1951), Hushang Golshiri (1938-2000) and Bahram Sadeqi (1938-1984), the presence of the garden has been an indispensable element. Poets have repeatedly hoped to find within some garden ground "a red rose soft and sweet as [the beloved's] soft cheek," where you should go, to learn from the nightingale the secrets of love (Bell, 1987, p. 113). In the Qur'an, a certain "Garden of Eternity" is promised to the God-fearing as their "reward and ultimate resort" (Fakhry, 2000, p. 359). Gardens in art have often been considered an archetypal symbol of the Garden of Eden, connoting fertility and plenitude (Brookes, 1987; Moynihan, 1980; Shaygan, 1993). They have

also been a suitable place to bury the dead. Gardens, it seems, assert their authority even when they are not meant to have such an authority. One of the modern works of Persian fiction in which gardens play a significant role is *Malakut* (ملکوت).

Published in 1961, *Malakut*, the only longer fictional work of Bahram Sadeqi (1936-1984), stands out as one of the most original works of fiction for its gripping narrative. The novella is about the journey taken by a young secretary, a fat man, and an unknown man to save their possessed friend Mr. Maveddat. In their quest to save him they are brought to Dr. Hatam's clinic, who exorcises the jinni out of his stomach. Dr. Hatam convinces Mr. Maveddat's friends to get a miraculous injection that would ensure a prolonged life with unending sensual pleasures; an injection that, as we learn later, will kill them in over a week, just like everybody else in the town. Meanwhile, on the upper floor of the clinic, there is a mysterious patient called M. L. who is waiting to have his last limb cut off. The story begins in a "green garden" in "that pleasant moonlit night," and moves through seductions in a garden of sin and death; it ends abruptly around dawn the next morning on the outskirts of the first garden with most of the characters either dead or dying. Moreover, there is a third garden which forces its presence upon the consciousness of the text whenever possible. In the present study, thus, the significance of the gardens in *Malakut* is studied in the light of Freudian theory of drives to show how these three gardens signify, respectively, life drive, death drive and the reappearance of a repressed garden.

Freud (1961) proposed the theory of drives in a period between the two World Wars. Traumatic neurosis of war and peace, dreams that return to the moment of trauma, the compulsion to repeat unpleasant experiences, a child exclaiming "fort" and "da" as the reel of his toy string disappears and returns to his crib, all cast serious doubts on the validity of the pleasure principle as the only motivator for human action and behavior, and made Freud suggest, after long hesitations and vacillations, that there must exist some other force which goes beyond the pleasure principle. What he confronted with was a more primary force than pleasure principle which he called "death drive". The discovery of death drive, however, paradoxically undermines and revives the authority of the pleasure principle. At first glance, a battle seems to have broken out between the self-preserving pleasure principle and self-destructive death drive, a "battle of the giants that our nurse-maids try to appease with their lullaby about Heaven" (Storr, 1989, p. 68). Whereas the aim of the pleasure principle is to bind the mobile energies and create ever greater unities, death drive comes to undermine that process by unbinding and destroying such unities.

Further investigations into the nature of death drive in *Beyond the Pleasure Principle* (1961) proved for Freud that the giants happen to fight for as much as

against each other, that “the pleasure principle seems actually to serve death [drive] The pleasure principle, then, is a tendency operating in the service of a function whose business is to free the mental apparatus entirely from excitation or to keep the amount of excitation in it constant or to keep it as low as possible” (Freud, 1961, pp. 56-57). By making the distinction between tendency and function, Freud (1961) gives death drive a more primary role than the pleasure principle. Moreover, instead of previously antagonistic opposition between the “giants,” he develops a dialectic relationship between them, which in turn revives the pleasure principle as “life drive.” Death drive (Thanatos) pushes the organism forward to the final aim of life, which is death. Yet, life drive (Eros) by starting anew prolongs the long road to that aim. According to Freud, cooperation between the drives is hoped to finally lead the living organism to a state of inorganic quiescence, to “Swinburne’s ‘The Garden of Proserpine,’ where no stimuli from either within or without disturb its everlasting peace” (Storr, 1989, p. 66).

The theory of drives applies primarily to human psyche. However, there have been artists who have thematized the role and relationship of the drives in their works, and critics who have borrowed it to discuss politics and various forms of cultural artifacts (DeLauretis, 2008; Smith, 1989). Brooks, for instance, rereads *Beyond the Pleasure Principle* not just as a model of human mental apparatus, but also as a “text concerning textuality” (Brooks, 1987, p. 112). Thus, instead of studying the author’s, reader’s or character’s unconsciousness, Brooks considers narrative as an organism, which like human life, is shaped and governed by the drives. In his view, the pleasure principle (desire) is the very motor of narrative, and “if the motor of narrative is desire, totalizing, building ever-larger units of meaning, the ultimate determinants of meaning lie *at the end*, and narrative desire is ultimately, inexorably, desire *for the end*” (Brooks, 1987, p. 52)—desire is primarily a Lacanian term which refers to the difference between need and demand. Freud had already concluded in *Beyond the Pleasure Principle* that “it is the difference in amount between the pleasure of satisfaction which is demanded and that which is actually achieved that provides the driving factor which will permit of no halting at any position attained” (Freud, 1969 p. 36). In the present study, pleasure principle, life drive, Eros and desire are used interchangeably.

The drives manifest themselves in many forms and in different proportions at different times. Death drive, for example, takes the form of masochism if directed toward the self, and sadism, if directed toward the external objects. Though the drives are co-present in every organism, in art as an organism one drive might be given more time and space when it comes to representation (mimesis), resulting in the dominance of one drive or the other. Bahram Sadeqi’s *Malakut* appears to be dominated by death drive.

2. Argument

In the gloomy days of 1950s, a generation of loss was born in Iran. Intellectuals—writers, journalists, artists, and professors—found their hopes betrayed as the 1953 (28th Mordad) coup d'état toppled Dr. Mossadeq's government down. This was not just a political failure in materializing democracy, but a failure of intellectualism, a loss of everything. Imported existentialism and distorted Marxism added more salt to the mortal wounds of intellectuals, marking among a group of promising youths the tragic age of anxiety, fear, depression, melancholy, confusion, addiction, untimely death and suicide. Among the many suicides was Manuchehr Fatehi, a classmate and close friend of Bahram Sadeqi. Fatehi's suicide note read: "I killed myself because I didn't feel like living"—Fatehi's suicide left an indelible impression on Sadeqi's mind; Sadeqi would always blame himself for his friend's death. It was in this context that one of the best Iranian fiction writers Bahram Sadeqi lived and wrote.

Bahram Sadeqi (1936-1984) was quite familiar with "Freud and Freudianism." As a student at the Medical School of Tehran University, psychoanalysis became a permanent subject of his studies. Sadeqi defended his doctoral thesis entitled "*A Modern View of Sexual Impotency*" in 1973. Though he served dutifully as a physician, he was not interested in medicine. He decided that writing was the best method of analyzing the minds and souls of the people. He published some poems and short stories in several magazines and periodicals, and in no time made a reputation for himself as an original short story writer. *Malakut* was first published in the periodical *Kayhān-e Hafta* in 1961 (No. 12, pp.7-101). Nine years later it was published together with several short stories in a collection entitled *Sangar-o Qomqome-ha-ye Khali (The Trench and the Empty Flasks)*. Accordingly, it may be argued that his studies in Freudian psychoanalysis effected Sadeqi in shaping the three gardens of *Malakut*.

A garden has many meanings both in life and in art. They have had private and public recreational use. The ancient Persians believed in the existence of a guardian angel of gardens who becomes infuriated if the plants and flowers are damaged. Appropriate geographical conditions have helped the gardens remain a part of the life of the Persians. In the Persian art, gardens have always played a significant role. Through the rich history of its literature, gardens have appeared, disappeared, and returned. In the works of the earlier poets such as Nezami, attention was given to describing the visual beauties of gardens. Later, poets like Hafiz and Sa'di gave metaphoric meanings to them. Bahram Sadeqi's *Malakut*, a perfect example of a modern work of Persian fiction, draws on all these classic artistic resources, yet gives gardens new meanings. In *Malakut*, "garden" is not necessarily a real "piece of land next to or around your house where you can grow

flowers, fruit, vegetables, etc.” as *Oxford Dictionary* defines it; rather, it is a sign. The word *bāq* (signifier) itself creates for the characters of the novella the concept of garden (signified) in their minds, regardless of the real descriptive features of a garden. In other words, garden becomes a sign whose meaning is understood by the people sharing a particular sign system. Thus, a “yard full of flowers and trees” is not necessarily a garden, whereas a green plot of land with only one tree could be considered a garden. In the last chapter of *Malakut*, there is an argument between Mr. Maveddat and his friends over whether there is difference between sitting “in” the garden or “on the outskirts” of it. In fact, the outskirt, with trees and a stream is more likely to be considered as a garden; however, because it is not called a “garden,” none of the characters sees it as a garden. The word *bāq*, whenever used in *Malakut*, refers to gardens in the sense the characters of the story see them to be, and in the sense that the reader can clearly understand what they mean.

2.1 Garden of Life Drive

The garden in the beginning of the text, the first garden, is different from that in the middle, both in its imagery and the characters who are born in it – born for the reader. These differences make the first garden the textual expression of the life drive in *Malakut*. Here is the opening paragraph of the novella:

That Wednesday night at eleven, Mr. Maveddat was possessed by the jinni. Given the usual lively and strange look on his face, everyone could imagine how shocked he looked after this event. In that pleasant moonlit night Mr. Maveddat and three of his friends had a picnic in a green garden. The full moon had given a poetic aura to everything, creating eerie shadows and shimmers in the brook, as if eternity was in creation. There was softness and coolness in the air, and the invisible light waved, and from far away, unknown murmurs rose and fell on the ground like fog. (Sadeqi, 1961, p. 5).

In addition to its beauty, peace and quietness, there is something “creative” about this green garden. It is the seat of creation of the narrative. In other words, the garden gives birth to the narrative. It has brought the characters together, thus functioning as the life drive of the text in binding them in a larger unity. Moreover, the characters associated with this garden share certain qualities which make them representatives of how life drive manifests itself in terms of characterization in *Malakut*. Except for the unknown man who is a neutral character “of whom we know nothing, and will not ever know” (Sadeqi, 1961, p. 7)—the unknown man is an eavesdropper for the narrator—the young secretary, the fat man, and Mr. Maveddat are concerned about their physical health and well-being; they are married or like to marry; they are working hard to gain more wealth; they wish to live a long

life and enjoy fresh air and open space. The young secretary has a simple philosophy of work and marriage. He is content with the basic requirements of life such as food. He “imagines that there is no evil in the world” and wants to help everyone. He likes fresh air, the sun and mountains (pp.15-16). The fat man is a well-known tradesman who likes to “live for a hundred years, stay fat and healthy, and marry many times” (p.8). He suffers from hypochondria so much so that he always stays outdoors to have fresh air. Finally, Mr. Maveddat is a property owner who wants to marry many times and live a long life (pp. 12 & 51). In short, all three are doing their best to create ever greater familial and social unities, and preserve them. Life drive seems to have won the battle in the young secretary, the fat man, and Mr. Maveddat’s characters—those who come from the garden of life drive. From a narratological perspective, and as Brooks notes, the characters in the beginning of the narrative are “‘desiring machines’ whose presence in the text creates and sustains narrative movement through the forward march of desire” (Brooks, 1987, pp. 40-41).

The intrusion of the jinni, however, disturbs the equilibrium of the first garden, and sets the characters on a fatal quest. The jinni makes Mr. Maveddat and his friends leave the garden. It is an external object which functions as a stimulus to direct the beginning of the narrative in *Malakut* into the complications of the middle. With the Jinni’s intrusion, the formerly blessed and happy characters are forced to start a long journey, a quest for seeking new life for Mr. Maveddat; a journey with circuitous paths to nothing but death.

The sense of achieving something at the end—as if a Holy Grail, a life-giving fountain, or the Garden of Eden lies at the end point of the journey—gives the narrative of *Malakut* a sense of end-orientedness. This is intensified by an allusion to the Qur’an; a verse foreboding of painful doom and punishment which overshadows the garden of life drive in the beginning of the text. The allusion creates an apocalyptic presentiment that the plot will end soon and unpleasantly. The Qur’anic allusion also anticipates the movement forward of the plot, the fact that it must undergo a process, an “arabesque,” and paradoxically enough, the plot will be punished for moving forward, for its prospective past, the past in the future—“Plot is a kind of arabesque or squiggle toward the end” (Brooks, 1987, p.104). It also creates a sense of expectation, a desire to gain knowledge of the end, of what we are tragically deprived in our own lives. Chapter three of *Malakut* begins with another allusion, this time from the Bible, which gives even stronger apocalyptic ambiance to the text: “And I beheld, and heard an angel flying through the midst of heaven, saying with a loud voice, *woe, woe, woe*, to the inhabitants of the earth” (Revelations 8, p. 13). In fact, the Qur’anic verse functions as a sign that the inhabitancy of the characters in the garden of life drive is fleeting, and the Biblical one foreshadows that this movement is oriented toward a disastrous end. Nevertheless, the characters

are out of one garden and into another. When the characters arrive at the second garden, the jinni encodes a message of Mr. Maveddat's death on a piece of note. Mr. Maveddat is to die of a terminal cancer in a few days.

2.2 Garden of Death Drive

The garden in the middle of the text stands for the death drive in *Malakut* because of its imagery and the characters inhabiting it. To associate gardens with life drive, given the mythical, religious and real life practices of human beings, appears quite plausible; however, gardens are as fatal as life-giving. *The Garden of Death* (1904), a well-known fresco painting by Hugo Simberg, depicts three skeletons of death taking care of a garden, as if death is the guardian of gardens. There are also trees like the cypress that represent both death and eternal life. One of the trees most frequently found in Islamic gardens is "the cypress, which represents both death and eternal life – death, because it is the only tree which, once cut down to the trunk, never sprouts again; and eternal life, because of its evergreen nature and upward-thrusting shape (McIntosh, 2005, p. 43; see also the Appendix of the same book for some more plants that have life-and-death meaning, including acacia, box, ivy, mistletoe, and myrtle.) In addition to "some garden vices" discussed in *A Philosophy of Gardens*, it is not difficult in our own age to find every now and then some piece of news relating a dead body found in a cozy urban garden (Cooper, 2006, pp. 99-107). In *Malakut*, one of those gardens of death appears in Dr. Hatam's house—his clinic and house are the same building. Mr. Mavaddat's friends drive him, with hearts full of hope, to Dr. Hatam's clinic to be healed, and apparently Dr. Hatam is their savior. He removes the jinni out of Mr. Maveddat's stomach, and offers the young secretary and the fat man a miraculous injection which would presumably guarantee a long life with unending sensual pleasures. However, what governs this part of *Malakut* is a garden of death drive; the garden which seems to neutralize the life-giving forces of the first garden.

The second garden, where Dr. Hatam's deadly relationship with Saqi is presented in the story, stands for the garden of death drive. This garden as seen through Saqi's eyes, Dr. Hatam's present wife, is described as a place of sin and wickedness. Saqi is well aware of the deathly garden they live in, and wants to leave it as soon as possible. She wishes that no buds would ever blossom in the garden (Sadeqi, 1961, p. 60). In a dialogue between Saqi and Dr. Hatam, it becomes clear how different the second garden is from the first one (p. 59):

- Saqi: *I have always liked the sun, gardens with flowers. But I hate this orange garden, though we are finally leaving it.*
- Dr. Hatam: *Why? Do you hate this garden?*

- Saqi: *Yes, this one. It reminds me of sin and wickedness . . . unwilling sin and pleasurable wickedness!*
- Dr. Hatam: *My mysterious Saqi! We'll buy a house full of flowers and trees and with no orange gardens.*

As mentioned above, it is the word *bāq* (garden) itself, and not a real plot of land full of flowers and trees, that frightens Saqi. She fears the sign which creates the concept of the garden of death drive for her, and thus wants to leave it as soon as possible. In fact, it is Saqi who, with her affair with M. L.'s servant, turns the second garden into a place of sin, and Dr. Hatam, with his compulsion to kill people, turns the garden into a place of death. Unlike the garden of life drive which was governed by creative forces, the garden of death drive is governed by destructive forces. However, the characters born in the garden of death drive, namely Dr. Hatam and M. L., are complex and unlike the first group of characters, are governed by the death drive as much as life drive. In other words, the drives are copresent in Dr. Hatam and M. L.'s characters; nevertheless, it is the death drive which, at the end of the night, wins the battle. The copresence of the drives in Dr. Hatam's character is noticeable in his physical appearance as much as in his name. He is "a tall well-built man with a healthy body," but has "the most feeble head and neck in the world" (Sadeqi, 1961, p.9). He is a wandering serial killer whose age is not clear. His life is torn between a desire to marry and have children and a compulsion (repetition compulsion) to kill people with his lethal injection. It is pleasing for him to watch the dead bodies of people swell and stink on the streets (Sadeqi, 1961, p. 24). In short, a battle is going on in his character:

Let me confess: In this age, I feel most ready to love, and to make love. No one might understand, but as you can see my hands and feet are brisk, strong and healthy, but my head is old, as old as my age. I've often thought that the duality I've always felt in my life is the result of this condition. One side of my body calls me to life and the other to death. I feel this duality more deadily and intensely in my soul. (p. 18)

Whereas *Hatam* means "generous," ironically his gift to people is death. Dr. Hatam's question is not "to be" or "not to be." Rather, he wants to know whether he must yield to the *Malakut* (authority, power) of the earth or of heaven:

I feel I can always exist. But, my problem is this: I don't know which one I should choose, the *Malakut* of the earth, or of the heaven? This is all chance, both have a special attraction. Like a piece of iron, I am whirled between two strong opposing poles, and sometimes I think God is blowing it out of proportion. And

I'm no more than a puppet, and he is playing me off too far
(p. 19).

For Dr. Hatam, people like the fat man who wish to live a long life are pathetic—most of the citizens have taken the presumably life-prolonging injection, thus most are pathetic. Life for him is a boring entertainment (Sadeqi, 1961, p. 20). He hates them because of their desire to live longer; thus, by pretending to have the means to fulfill this desire, he eliminates them.

2.3 Return of the Repressed

As expected, M. L., the other character associated with the garden of death drive, shares most of Dr. Hatam's qualities, however, with one important difference. M. L. has directed the destructive forces of death drive toward other people as much as toward himself. Similar to Dr. Hatam in killing other people, M. L. has shot a peasant and his son dead, has murdered his own son and has also cut his servant's tongue. He has been waiting in the clinic for twelve days to have his last remaining limb removed, his right hand. He has had most of his body members amputated, and has kept them in jars to always watch them. Like his body his name has been cut down into initials. On the one hand, he is not afraid of death; "he welcomes it" (Sadeqi, 1961, p.25). On the other, he is "afraid of death, and [is] fleeing from it because it dishonors [him], turns [him] into dust, into food for worms and insects, and [he] want[s] to turn to good, and start anew what is good, and fall in love, and have a child . . ." (Sadeqi, 1961, p.45). So far, he is like Dr. Hatam in whom the eternal battle of the giants is being fought, with always death drive wining. They are those who come from the garden of death drive. However, M. L. is saved by a garden he has been trying to repress all his life. Before permitting the third garden to express itself, we need to consider the function of repetition and return in *Malakut*.

Textual repetition, Brooks (1987) maintains, including rhyme, alliteration, assonance, meter, refrain, and the repetition of a certain plot, like return *to* an already covered place (return to the beginning or origin), or return *of* a repressed plot, are how death drive manifests itself in literature (p. 99). It is through repetition and return that death drive wards off any danger of short circuit. As all organisms must die their proper death, so plots must find their proper end. In *Malakut*, there are both return to an earlier state and return of the repressed. The progress of the plot from the town to the first garden, and then to the second garden in the town, and finally back to the outskirts of the first garden is in fact a struggle to return to the origin, to the beginning. This return of course fails. Nevertheless, repetition is necessary to secure the plot against the perils of an improper ending. In narrative, as in life, achieving an aim too soon ruins "the pleasure of the road and driving" (Sadeqi, 1961, p. 6). Return of the repressed leads us back to M. L.'s character.

To atone for his past sins, M. L. frequents Dr. Hatam's clinic to have his body members cut off—a form of masochism. M. L., who resembles God who killed his son (Jesus), and like the fallen Adam is laden with the unbearable weight of sin, tells Dr. Hatam that he has undergone an epiphany, that death is the last thing he looks forward to, and that instead he desires to live, to fall in love and to have another son (Golshiri, 1999, p. 229). He wants to forget all his past life and return to the inorganic state of Lethe; “but, oh oblivion, I know you will not come, for you do not exist and I know it cannot be forgotten, because there is no oblivion in the world, as there is nothing . . . even crying” (Sadeqi, 1961, p. 26). What he wants to forget is in fact a garden. As soon as he starts writing his life story, the repressed garden of his innocent childhood forces its presence upon his consciousness, and that brings him salvation, though too late because he has fallen victim to Dr. Hatam's injection too. The garden, in any case, asserts its undeniable presence; it wants to be seen, or rather written. M. L. remembers the day he was twelve years old and had gone to the garden with his family: “I had become like the day I was twelve, and we were in the garden, . . . the day we sat in the garden, and I played with the rose flowers” (Sadeqi, 1961, p. 41). The memory of this garden makes M. L. remember his mother and his own innocent childhood. And with the garden, through dreaming and the power of imagination, a “resurrection” happens in him. With his last remaining limb he starts writing his life story, which is a way to relive the painful experience of the past through repetition. M. L. wonders why he is not “to have pleasure like other people, to enjoy the sun and the moon, to wake up early in the morning, to marry and wear nice clothes . . .” (Sadeqi, 1961, p. 67). However, as mentioned above, it is too late. All the characters die or are dying on the outskirts of the first garden. The narrative has reached its final equilibrium, and no one wants to return to the first garden to disturb such equilibrium. If they had reentered it, more tensions would have been created. In other words, the drives have worked properly for reaching the final discharge of textual energy. There is no return because the characters do not desire to return. They do not want another garden. While amazed and surprised, even a dog awaits an ending, the novella ends abruptly but properly (Sadeqi, 1961, p. 77). The characters are well aware of the difference between sitting in the garden and on its outskirts. As the last chapter of the book is entitled “The Earth”, the characters choose the *Malakut* of the earth, not heaven: “Mr. Maveddat stood up and said: Shall we go to the garden? The Fat Man shouted: Where shall we go then? Aren't you tired yet? Mr. Maveddat said: you know I'm afraid that damn thing will come again. Hadn't we better stay here next to the water?” (Sadeqi, 1961, p. 76).

In the very last scene of the story, Mr. Maveddat and his friends are talking, this time in an open space outside the first garden, when Dr. Hatam arrives to tell them that they have only a week left to live. The fat man dies immediately. The desire for life and happiness drives the young man to try to get the best out of his

remaining days on earth. The novella ends simply with “it dawned” without any further explanation because the narrative has reached its “quiescence of nonnarratable” (Brooks, 1987, p. 108).

3. Conclusion

The double nature of gardens as both life-giving and death-giving has been represented in one of the modern works of Persian fiction, *Malakut*. In fact, as human beings are governed both by a drive to create and bind, and a drive to destruct and unbind, gardens are also governed by creative and destructive forces. There is a dialectic relationship between gardens and human beings. Gardens have had important functions in the everyday lives of human beings and more important roles in their art. Nevertheless, gardens have not always remained life-giving. Human beings, in return, through their deeds and thoughts have sometimes made them gardens of life drive and other times of death drive. In *Malakut*, there is a garden of life drive in the beginning of the story, a garden which represents the desire of people to live, which is also a desire for narratives. The garden of death drive in the middle manifests the destructive forces of people, and the desire of narrative to find its proper death. There is also a repressed garden of memory which saves M. L. from death. The characters born in the first garden seem to be the incarnations of life drive, the character types of how the pleasure principle manifests itself in *Malakut*. The second garden represents characters in whom death drive has won the battle. And it is the repressed garden in M. L.’s life that resurrects him. All M. L. does, from having cut his body members, to taking endless journeys, is to forget the garden; however, it cannot be forgotten. The memory of garden is so rooted in Persians’ unconsciousness that sooner or later, and by one way or another, it would assert its presence. It is perhaps in choosing the *Malakut* of the earth that the modern works of fiction and the modern gardens have become more a place of destruction and death than creation and life. Gardens remain an indispensable element both in life and in art. And, *Malakut* remains a lullaby for the readers to appease the battle of the giants, the battle which seems to have left no one and no garden unharmed.

References

- Bell, G. L. (1897). *Poems from the Divan of Hafiz* (Trans). London: William Heinemann.
- Brooks, P. (1987). *Reading for the plot: Design and intention in narrative*. London: Harvard UP.
- Brookes, J. (1987). *Gardens of paradise: The history and design of the great Islamic gardens*. New York: New Amsterdam Books.

- Cooper, D. E. (2006). *A philosophy of gardens*. New York: Oxford UP.
- DeLauretis, T. (2008). *Freud's drive: Psychoanalysis, literature, and film*. London: Palgrave MacMillian.
- Fakhry, M. (2000). *An interpretation of the Qur'an* (Trans). Lebanon: Garnet Publishing.
- Freud, S. (1961). *Beyond the pleasure principle*. Trans. James Strachey. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, Inc.
- Golshiri, H. (1999). *Bāq-dar-bāq [The garden in the garden: Collected papers]*. Tehran: Nilufar.
- McIntosh, C. (2005). *Gardens of the gods: Myth, magic, and meaning*. New York: I.B. Tauris.
- Moynihan, E. (1980). *Paradise as a garden*. New York: Braziller.
- Sadeqi, B. (1961) *Malakut*. Tehran: Zamān.
- Shaygan, D. (1993). *Bot-hāye-zehni va khatereye-azali [The idols of the mind and perennial memory: Essays on comparative philosophy]*. Tehran: Amir Kabir.
- Smith, R. R. (2010). *Death-Drive: Freudian hauntings in literature and art*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Storr, A. (1989). *Freud: A very short introduction*. New York: Oxford University Press.