

Continuity of Thought in the Poems of Ḥāfiẓ

A synopsis of the study.

Apart from the difficulties of textual criticism and biographical documentation, Ḥāfiẓ' poetry poses the controversial problems of poetic structure and meaning. My study proposes to concentrate on these last two problems.

The first complaint about the incoherence of Ḥāfiẓ' poems came from his patron. The disconnected style of Ḥāfiẓ later became popular in the 'Indian' school. Today it is criticized by many Orientals (e.g. A. Kasravī, H. Ajni, S. A. Vahid), who consider incoherence to be the wrong road for Persian poetry.

Some other scholars,¹ having considered the loose associative ties that link the poems of Ḥāfiẓ, explain that this poetry does contain a logic of its own, and is therefore not difficult. I believe that Ḥāfiẓ' patron was in the right in complaining of the obscurity of his protégé's poems. Ḥāfiẓ' poetry must be classified as difficult poetry, and here I should like to note two concepts which in Persian poetry must be clearly distinguished:

- a) Logical continuity, which very often means plot continuity.²
- b) Continuity achieved solely by means of psychological association.³

¹ R. Lescot, *Essai d'une chronologie de l'oeuvre de Ḥāfiẓ*, *Bulletin d'études orientales*, T. 10, Damas 1944, p. 61. »Tout poème de Ḥāfiẓ comporte donc un fil directeur qui commande le sens, . . . qu'il convient d'accorder à chacun des vers qui le composent.» See also H. R. Roemer, *Probleme der Hafizforschung und der Stand ihrer Lösung*. Pp. 109—110.

² New critics would call this (in their own special sense) the structure of the poem. See W. Elton, *A Glossary of the New Criticism*, *Poetry* 73: 5, p. 302.

³ Poems of this category exist, and are, to use Valéry's words, 'absolument vides d'idées'. See pp. 20—21 of this study.

Poems from Ḥāfiẓ' different periods afford a striking example of these two polarities. In Europe, the boundary between these two types of continuity may be drawn between the early work of Arthur Rimbaud and his *Illuminations*. In the latter he adopts an ambiguous technique, based solely on psychological associations.

I think that it is fruitful for discussion about the structure of Ḥāfiẓ poems to adopt the idea of an analogy between the stylistic innovations of Ḥāfiẓ and the innovations of the 'modern movement' in Europe, now a hundred years old. The modernism of today is a facet of a literary phenomenon which seems to recur time and again in different periods. I shall here consider the modernism introduced in Persian literature of the 14th century by Ḥāfiẓ, a modernism whose stylistic features survived well into the 19th century. I propose to point out an analogy between this and European modernism of the 19th and 20th centuries. It is not unjust to say that the most typical exponents of this last are the supporters of *poésie pure*, Mallarmé and Valéry.¹

*

¹ H. Friedrich, Die Struktur der modernen Lyrik. »Die Gründer und noch heutigen Führer der modernen Lyrik Europas sind Franzosen des 19. Jahrhunderts, nämlich Rimbaud und Mallarmé.« P. 7. »Auch alle sonstigen Merkmale moderner Lyrik treten in diesem Begriff [poésie pure] zusammen, . . .« P. 104. |

*Ḥāfiz' ċe mīgūyad?*¹ — What does Ḥāfiz say? This is the title of an interesting book by Aḥmad Kasravī. If we are looking for original philosophical thinking, modern Persian literature will offer us little unless we go beyond the geographical boundaries of Persia, say to Pakistan and one of the moderns, Iqbal. Aḥmad Kasravī, born in 1888 and murdered in 1945 by the Royalists, was one of the few to have made an attempt at a new mode of thought. He was a pupil of E. Herzfeld, and translated several books from Pehlevi into Neo-Persian and wrote scholarly works on Persian history. In the speeches and writings which were meant for a wider public, he attempted to restore the damaged national consciousness of Persians.² The book mentioned above provokes a good many thoughts, despite its many clumsy passages, even, one might say, its grotesque features.

In the second chapter of this book Kasravī inquires into how poets really construct their ghazals. He takes as an example Ḥāfiz' ghazal:

Dar ḍamīr-e mā namīgūnḡad beḡair az dūst kas

— — —

Kasravī claims that it is futile to seek any plot or purpose in this poem. Each couplet is separate, and no continuity of thought links them. He considers this ghazal typical of Ḥāfiz' purposeless poetry made for the sake of making poetry. The train of thought is chiefly dictated by the rhyme. Kasravī then turns to a study of the sources of Ḥāfiz' philosophy. He finds eight:

- 1) The Koran and its exegetes
- 2) Greek philosophy
- 3) The Sufis and their 'baseless dogmas'
- 4) The praisers of the pleasures of wine or drinking companions,
ḡarābātīḡar
- 5) The battle between the praisers of the pleasures of wine and the Sufis
- 6) The history of Iran and its ancient tales
- 7) Astrology
- 8) Fatalism and 'the bad teachings of fatalists'

¹ Tehrān 1957, 4th ed.

² B. Alavi, *Geschichte und Entwicklung der modernen persischen Literatur*, Berlin 1964, pp. 177—178.

Kasravī is one of the Persian scholars who ascribe the decay of Persian culture, intellectual and material, to the Mongol raids of 1219—1336. Anyone who has travelled in Persia is familiar with this tendency among intellectuals to put the blame for practically everything on the Mongols. In reply, it might be said that in 1300, Persian-Arabic culture had already had five hundred years of supremacy in Iran. The declining dynamisms of this development provide ample explanation for a certain exhaustion. Kasravī studies various phenomena from the point of view of Persian political history, trying to define their effects on Persia's political power as good or bad. He introduces Ḥāfiẓ as a writer with a negative historical effect. According to him, Ḥāfiẓ was at once the victim and the expression of the cultural decadence which followed the Mongol attacks.

At the end of the tenth chapter of his book, Kasravī asks why Sa'dī and Ḥāfiẓ are so widely praised in both East and West. Of the orientals, Kasravī comments that they only 'want to cry up their own wares', of the Western admirers of Ḥāfiẓ he says that, as they wish to keep the East in the state of lassitude expressed by him, they have imperialistic motives for wanting his outlook to survive.

This view of the European attitude towards Ḥāfiẓ seems unlikely and grotesque. One need only think of Goethe's great efforts to understand the poetry of Ḥāfiẓ and of the East in general, a task with which it seems impossible to link even the mere mention of imperialism. There is little truth in Kasravī's sentence: »The Divan of Ḥāfiẓ is more useful to them [the Europeans] than an army of a million men.»

In this study we are mainly interested in Kasravī's first chapter, where he treats the discontinuity of Ḥāfiẓ' thought at great length, and those parts of the book in which he scorns Ḥāfiẓ as 'Ḥāfiẓ the Idle Talker', *Ḥāfiẓ-e čaranda-gū*, and 'Ḥāfiẓ the Nonsense-Talker', *Ḥāfiẓ-e yāve-gū*.

Kasravī is far from being original in accusing Ḥāfiẓ' poems of incoherence, even though he does not seem to know of earlier discussions on the question. As Roemer¹ notes in his excellent synopsis of

¹ Akad. Wiss. u. d. Literatur. Abhandlungen d. Kl. der Literatur Jhrg. 1951: 3 Wiesbaden. Hans Robert Roemer, Probleme der Hafizforschung und der Stand ihrer Lösung.

the results of Ḥāfiẓ studies, Ḥāfiẓ' patron himself, Šāh Šuġā', accuses him of incoherent poetry.¹ This is told us by Ḥōndamīr, the literary historian.² This concept of incoherence is familiar to modern scholars, who are interested in the Indian poet Iqbal, and give him the credit for restoring unity of thought to the ghazal.³ A reading of Iqbal's ghazals will convince us of the truth of this, vigorous as they are and reflecting a unified thought in which a European philosophical training is clearly mirrored.

Some modern European scholars, too, have been disturbed by the discontinuity of thought in the poetry of Ḥāfiẓ. In *The Persian Language*,⁴ Reuben Levy quotes Ḥāfiẓ' ghazal *Dar azal partov-e ḥusnal zi taġallī dam zad*, and remarks that it is one of the few of Ḥāfiẓ' poems enjoyable because of its continuity of thought. It is true that this poem is exceptional among Ḥāfiẓ' works. Its span ranges from the beginning of Eternity to a realistically described present beside the beloved; the thought is logically developed from line to line.⁵ It would be impossible to change the order of the couplets.

Ḥāfiẓ scholars of today have otherwise been clearly influenced by the structural methods of the modern literary criticism and in many cases have sought to prove the existence of a clearly thematic logic in Ḥāfiẓ' poems. Thus Roger Lescot says: «... pour ne s'attacher qu'au sens logique du texte, la plupart des pièces du Divan apparaissent comme admirablement construites. Tout s'y enchaîne avec une perfection rarement égalée... Tout poème de Ḥāfiẓ comporte donc un fil directeur qui commande le sens, amoureux, mystique ou bacchique, qu'il convient d'accorder à chacun des vers qui le composent. Lorsqu'on éprouve des difficultés à dégager cette idée maîtresse, c'est, presque toujours, que l'ordonnance de la pièce a été dérangée par un copiste négligent, ou encore que l'on commet quelque faute d'interprétation.»⁶ Thus, Lescot lays the blame for the discontinuity in

¹ Roemer, p. 5.

Ḥōndamīr, Ḥabīb as-siyar 111: 2 p. 37, see H. R. Roemer, *Probleme der Hafizforschung und der Stand ihrer Lösung*, p. 108.

³ S. A. Vahid, *Iqbal, his art and thought*, Hyderabad-Deccan 1948.

⁴ P. 86.

⁵ We return to this poem and Professor Levy's opinions of it later on p. 23.

⁶ R. Lescot, *Essai d'une Chronologie de l'oeuvre de Ḥāfiẓ*, *Bulletin d'études orientales*, T. 10, Damas 1944, p. 61.

Ḥāfiẓ' poems on negligent copyists, who have changed the order of the couplets and thus caused the impression of incoherence.

But let us try an experiment, taking, for example, the poem quoted by Kasravī in *Ḥāfiẓ ʿe miqūyad*:

1. dar ɖamīr-e mā namīgunḡad beḡair az dūst kas
har do 'ālam-rā be dušman deh ke mārā dūst bas
2. yār-e gandum gūn-e mā gar meil kardī nīm ḡou
har do 'ālam piš-e ɕašm-e mā namūdī yek 'adas
3. yād mīdārī ke būdī har zamān bā dīgarān
ey ke biyād-e to hargiz bar nayāvardam nafas
4. mīravī ɕūn šam' o ḡam'ī az pas ō pišat ravān
ney, ḡalaṭ guftam nabāšad šam'-rā ḡod piš o pas
5. ḡāfil ast ānkū be šamšīr az to mīpičad 'inān
qand-rā laḡḡat magar nikū namīdānad magas
6. ḡāṭīram vaqtī havas kardī ke bīnam ɕīzhā
tā to-rā dīdam nakardam ḡuz be dīdārat havas
7. mardumān-rā az 'asas šab gar ḡiyālī dar sar ast
man ɕenānam kas ḡiyālam bāz našnāsad 'asas
8. kūyat az aškam ɕu daryā ḡašt mītarsam ke bāz
bar sar āyand īn raqībān-e sabukbārat ɕu ḡas
9. Ḥāfiẓā īn rāh be-pā-ye lāše-ye lang-e to nīst
ba'd az īn benšīn ke gardī bar naḡīzad zīn faras

1. Nobody can be contained in our mind but the Friend,
Give the Two Worlds to the foe: the Friend is enough for us.
2. If you take our wheat-coloured Friend for half a groat,
The Two Worlds to our eyes seem one pulse-seed.
3. Do you remember how all the time you were with others?
Ah but I never drew a breath without remembering you.
4. You proceed like a candle and behind and in front of you
a crowd is going —
No, I made a slip: a candle has no in front and behind!
5. He is headless who twists away from you the reins with a sword:
Does not the fly well know that sugar has sweetness?
6. Once my mind was agog for me to see things:
Seeing you, I desired nought but the sight of you.
7. If people have in their heads a vision of the watchman at night,

I am such that the watchman cannot distinguish me from my vision.

8. Your street through my tears has turned into a sea; I fear that
These light-headed companions of yours will grow up like weeds.
9. Oh, Ḥāfiẓ, this taking this road is not for your lame carcass,
After this sit down so that no dust will be put up by this horse.¹

(Translation by Peter Avery)

The poem gains nothing in continuity of thought from any arrangement of these couplets; it acquires no plot, such as is shown in, e.g., the poem *Dar azal partov-e ḥusnat zi tağallī dam zad*, or most of the poems of Ġalāl ed-Dīn Rūmī. Thus, a copyist cannot remove from a poem a continuity which it proves impossible to restore. Here, in my opinion, we have one of Ḥāfiẓ' reforms, his movement away from continuity of thought to thematic coherence, from a 'plot-poem' to one with an artistic form, but no plot.

One modern scholar who defends the coherence of Ḥāfiẓ' poems is A. J. Arberry, one of the foremost modern experts on Persian literature. In *Fifty Poems of Ḥāfiẓ*,² one of his themes is that the young Ḥāfiẓ faithfully follows in the footsteps of Sa'dī's clear ghazals. The old Ḥāfiẓ, by contrast, has forsaken plotting and forms 'thematic patterns'. Every poem is constructed contrapuntally. First the themes, the 'thematic patterns', are put forward, later to be returned to, and finally culminating at the end of the poem. I feel that the remark about contrapuntal technique is valid, although Arberry does not quote any poems to prove the strength of his argument.³ On the other hand, it is more difficult to believe that Ḥāfiẓ' contrapuntal technique is not already evident in his early poems. I believe that the

¹ Ḥ. Peẓmān in his edition of Ḥāfiẓ' poems (Tehrān a.H. 1318) attributes this ghazal to Auḥadī of Marāḡe (a.D. 1271/72—1337/38). If Peẓmān is right, this poem shows that the reform of which Ḥāfiẓ was the leading exponent was not abrupt, but gradual (see p. 19 of this study). In the preface to his edition (p. 103) Peẓmān says: »The style of Ḥwāḡe is, in its use of vocables, very near to that of Auḥadī . . .».

² A. J. Arberry, *Fifty Poems of Ḥāfiẓ*, Cambridge 1953, pp. 28 etc.

³ At the end of this essay I shall try to analyse an incoherent but artistically superb poem and show how this contrapuntal technique works.

general characteristics of the poetry of Ḥāfiẓ were there while he was still young. This can be verified from a chronological anthology of Ḥāfiẓ' poems. In his famous book *Bahṭ dar āṭār va afkār va aḥvāl-e Ḥāfiẓ*, Qāsem Ġanī quotes 108 of Ḥāfiẓ' poems, roughly a quarter of his whole output. Most of them can be confidently dated, as the Shah, Vizier, or other important person to whom they are dedicated are mentioned in them. Nothing can be found in these poems to support Arberry's argument that it is only in later life that Ḥāfiẓ breaks the continuity of thought in the ghazal. I feel, for example, that the lament commemorating Ḥāfiẓ' first patron Abū Ishāq:

Yād bād ān-ke sar-e kū-ye to-am manzil būd

...

(Ġanī, p. 133)

is an example of how the young Ḥāfiẓ could write poems containing a variety of material and surprising couplets. On the other hand, as an old man Ḥāfiẓ wrote many poems as clear in thought as his characteristic style permits. Examples of this type are the poems dedicated to Šāh Yaḥyā:

Yak do ġāmam dī saḥargah ittifāq uftāde būd

...

(Ġanī, p. 371)

and

Ġouzā saḥar nihād ḥamāyil barābaram

...

(Ġanī, p. 403)

Although Arberry's theory is not quite acceptable in its entirety, his description of the development of Ḥāfiẓ' poetry shows deep insight. He compares the style of the ageing Ḥāfiẓ to that of the ageing Beethoven. Both of them tried, as they grew older, to free themselves from their own style. »It is as though the poet was growing weary, or perhaps feeling a distaste for the display of virtuosity; and having established his philosophy and perfected his technique, he was now experimenting in a sort of surrealist treatment of the ghazal. The

poems of this period are comparatively few in number, but they are in many ways the poet's most interesting productions; they will repay extended study, for they are quite unique in Persian literature, and have perhaps never been fully understood and appreciated; certainly no later poet seems to have attempted to continue these final experiments of the master craftsman.»¹

There could hardly be a better description of some of the late poems of Ḥāfiẓ. A comparison between them and the opera of Beethoven numbered over one hundred is proper: they display a powerful urge to reach beyond the boundaries of their maker's art. We might say the same about the later works of Goethe. He too was »growing weary or perhaps feeling a distaste for the display of virtuosity». This can be seen in the *West-östlicher Divan*, which the critics of his time found difficult to place and understand. We shall return to the relationship of Goethe and Ḥāfiẓ later. When thinking of Arberry's last quoted sentence, ». . . certainly no later poet seems to have attempted to continue these final experiments . . .», we should take a closer look at the later poets. To trace the followers of Ḥāfiẓ' incoherence in Persian poetry would require a separate study, but some poets can be mentioned here. Ambiguity of style was especially popular in the 'Indian' school of Persian poetry (about 1500—1800 A.D.). H. Ajni in his monograph *Bedil' i ego poema 'Irfon'* gives names of later poets for whom, as for Bīdil, »[the terminology of sufism] served as a veil behind which they could hide their thoughts from the tyrannical reaction» (p. 40).

Ḥāfiẓ was in the same position. That he had something to fear and to hide is shown by the fact that his grave was threatened with demolition in the 16th century because of his alleged heresy. Some of the poets of Bīdil's time whom Ajni mentions are Qāsembeg Dīvāne, who »... excelled in changeability of mood and incoherence of thought», Nāṣer 'Alī Sirhindī and Moḥammad Eḡād. Sultānhwāge Adā». . . was a follower of Bīdil in respect of complexity and difficulty of style».²

About Indian style Ajni says: ». . . but the difficulties of style were massed on top of each other, and in this manner the clarity of thought was disrupted.» (P. 38).

¹ A. J. Arberry, *Fifty Poems of Ḥāfiẓ*, pp. 32—33.

² P. 40

»A style which partly expels the thought out of the poem, and replaces it with stylistic devices cannot be called popular.» (P. 39).

Friedrich Rosen maintains that the Indian poet Ġālib (died 1869) who wrote both in Persian and Urdu ». . . has successfully studied the style of poets like Ḥāfiz».¹

Let us return to consideration of why Aḥmad Kasravī and Muḥammad Iqbal forsook Ḥāfiz. For Aḥmad Kasravī, this was probably because his sense of the aesthetic values was less developed than his sociological tendencies. He was annoyed by Ḥāfiz' unsocial attitude, the *lā ubāliyye* of his philosophy, its indifference. These two critics of Ḥāfiz were also possessed of well-developed meditative powers, Kasravī's development being social and that of Iqbal philosophical. Kasravī considered Ḥāfiz a very poor teacher of the people, as he approved both of Sufic fatalism and the wine of the praiser of intoxication, '*ḥarābālīgar*'.

We have already noted that Kasravī ascribes Ḥāfiz' defective teaching in large part to the Mongol attacks which caused the decline in the morals of the Persians, formerly so heroic and virtuous. The voices of the praisers of wine, claiming that only in wine are the solutions of problems to be found, grew stronger. The Sufis, too, using the symbolism of the wine-drinker, also declared that consolation is to be found only in wine, i.e., according to their interpretation, in spiritual ecstasy, which Kasravī despised.

Kasravī's attitude is straightforwardly chauvinistic and didactic, but it has one feature in common with Iqbal's views. Both of them write slightly of Ḥāfiz' lack of capacity for logical thought. Their attitudes reveal this charge: Ḥāfiz cannot be grasped, all his poems end in a chaos of intangible concepts. Kasravī pursues a defined end: social reform and the improvement of the position of the poor. There is nothing in Ḥāfiz' poetry to support such a programme.

Why, then, has Muhammad Iqbal written:

'Do not drink the wine of Ḥāfiz,
for poison flows in it?'

¹ H. v. Glasenapp, *Die Literaturen Indiens*, Potsdam 1929, p. 223.

»An einzelnen Wendungen merkt man bei Ghālib das erfolgreiche Studium des Stils von Dichtern wie Ḥāfiz, z.B. wenn er sagt: Frag' mich nicht nach dem Rezept der Salbe für das gebrochene Herz, denn sie enthält als Hauptbestandteil Diamantenstaub.»

This is quite a different question from that asked by Kasravī. Iqbal's relation to Ḥāfiẓ had many sides. He understood Ḥāfiẓ' importance as a lyrical poet. His Ḥāfiẓ criticism is very different from Kasravī's. What, then, is the poison in the wine? It is probably Ḥāfiẓ' limitations in ethics and philosophy, fields highly esteemed by Iqbal. If the intellectual activities of man are divided, according to the old philosophic trichotomy,¹ into cognition, feeling and willing, it may be said that cognition and willing are, in Ḥāfiẓ, the lesser parts, while in Iqbal they are highly developed.

Most people today consider that Ḥāfiẓ' philosophy of life is basically optimistic.² But is this optimism, this faith in life, thinking? Is it not, rather, an aesthetic sensation marked by optimism? In *A History of Urdu Literature*³ Raṃ Babu Saksena mentions Ġālib as a great philosopher. Again, in *Studier over Ḥāfiẓ*,⁴ H. Rasmussen introduces Ḥāfiẓ as a kind of nature philosopher, a pantheist.

Ġālib can no more be called a philosopher than can Ḥāfiẓ. The proffering of separate, emotion-flavoured meditations is not philosophy in the sense of Rūmī's *Maṭnavī* or Iqbal's *Asrār-e ḥodī*.

All this is intended, not to define values, but to map the hazy boundary between thought and aesthetic emotion in Ḥāfiẓ' poetry.

According to classical philosophy, the will-power of man manifests itself in ethics. Let us then look at the ethics of Ḥāfiẓ.

Ḥāfiẓ was certainly no moralist.⁵ He seems to have a high regard for intoxicated beggar-philosophers, while not presenting his ideas systematically, as a doctrine of salvation. It was a fragment of a programme.

To illustrate this, we may compare the morals of Ḥāfiẓ with those of his great admirer, Goethe. If we use the word 'morals' of Goethe

¹ Max Apel, *Philosophisches Wörterbuch*, Berlin 1950, p. 255 and p. 51.

² H. R. Roemer, *Probleme der Hafizforschung und der Stand ihrer Lösung*. Akad. Wiss. u. Litt. Abh. 1951: 3. »Doch hat ihn Hafiz auf bemerkenswerte Weise abgewandelt. Er leitet daraus nicht etwa eine pessimistische Weltanschauung ab, sondern heitere Lebensfreude, nicht Resignation vor dem blind waltenden Schicksal, sondern Vertrauen auf die Güte Gottes.« P. 113.

³ Allahabad 1940.

⁴ Diss., Kobenhavn 1892, p. 138. »Ḥāfiẓ' poesie bliver derfor vaesentligt naturmystik, naturromantik.«

⁵ J. Rypka, *Iranische Literaturgeschichte*, Leipzig 1959, pp. 262—263.

and of Ḥāfiz, we find that we do not mean the same thing. The homosexuality of Ḥāfiz (which Goethe remarks on in *West-östlicher Divan*) becomes, in Goethe, the friendship of a wise old man and the desire to teach a green and inexperienced youth. Goethe's praise of wine is less reckless than that of Ḥāfiz. Kasravī's book described Ḥāfiz' other 'immoralities'.

Muhammad Iqbal's poetry also displays his thought and ethics.¹ His *Asrār-e ḥodī* and *Rumūz-e bīḥodī* form a complete handbook for the meditative and ethical development of a modern Moslem. It is clear that a body of work such as this is ethically hardly in the same position as Ḥāfiz' work.

A comparison with the period of Modernism in European literature, which began with Rimbaud and Mallarmé between the 1860s and the 1880s, will be useful to our thesis. There are many similarities between development in Europe after this period and development in Persian literature after Ḥāfiz. In drawing this parallel between the innovations of Mallarmé and Valéry and those of Ḥāfiz and his successors, I hope to bring the force of Ḥāfiz' innovations nearer home.²

Let us take two poems. First, *Je n'ai pas oublié, voisine de la ville*, No 109 in *Tableux Parisiens* by Baudelaire (1821—1867); second, a poem representing the next generation, more advanced, the sonnet *Le Vierge, le vivace* by Mallarmé (1842—1898).

Baudelaire's poem shows a thought that can be followed throughout the line, a plot capable of expression by concept. This plot may be less than perfectly clear, but it is there.

In Mallarmé's poem, on the other hand, we find no continuous train of thought taking us to a predetermined goal. It seems deliberately obscure, in defiance of earlier literary generations.³

¹ S. A. Vahid, Iqbal, London 1959, p. 144.

² Michaël I. Zand too, in his *Six Centuries of Glory*, Moscow 1967, has found affinity between the style of Ḥāfiz and the poetic styles of the present century: «... in these ghazals Hafiz applied quite consciously and consistently a method of revealing his hero's inner condition at which European literature first arrived only in the XX century.» P. 136.

³ Francis Scarfe, *The Art of Paul Valéry*, London 1954, p. 61: «The term 'poésie pure' has a history and can be traced back through Mallarmé to Baudelaire...»

Pp. 62—63: «Valéry went on to describe how, influenced by Wagner, the Symbolist poets found in music all the means and effects they desired to import

Mallarmé and his pupil Valéry are attempting to attain their ideal of reformed poetry, *poésie pure*. We might define this *poésie pure* as the result of abolishing all but the aesthetically effective from the poem. This includes the abolition of continuity of thought.

A similar tendency is distinguishable in Persian poetry. Before Ḥāfiz, a poet would seldom express himself obscurely. There are, of course, pre-Ḥāfizian poets whose work is obscure, but the reason does not lie in their stylistic aspirations. Ḥāfiz was the great watershed.¹ After Ḥāfiz we still find continuity of thought, for example in Ġāmī's poems, but it has been noticed earlier on pages 15—16 that the shadow of Ḥāfiz reaches at least to the 19th century, and possibly even further.

In Ḥāfiz' work we have the first expression of a characteristic that was later to become common. In one of his studies² W. Lentz seeks to prove that a style which commences by introducing the theme lightly is typical of modern Persian prose texts. This introduction is followed by a phase in which the original themes are ignored. Then the original themes are again brought up and arguments presented. Again there follow sections where nothing is definite, the treatment of the subject is circuitous, with no defined order. Thus the argumentation proceeds gradually, continually retracing its steps.

This extravagantly tortuous style must have been a thorn in the flesh of those, like Kasravī and Iqbal, who knew their countrymen well and were enthusiastic about European education.

into poetry. But they were discouraged by all the resources at the disposal of the orchestra, 'ils sortaient accablés des concerts'. He then restated an idea of Mallarmé's: 'Ce qui fut baptisé le Symbolisme se résume très simplement dans l'intention commune à plusieurs familles de poètes (d'ailleurs ennemies entre elles) de reprendre à la Musique leur bien.' It is not explained how or when 'leur bien' had ever been taken from them by music, though it might be implied that previous poets in their emphasis on thought (Vigny), rhetoric (Hugo) and vision (Gautier and the Parnassians) were responsible, or, as Julien Benda argues in a highly suggestive note on Mallarmé and Wagner, that the Symbolists were dimly aware that Wagner relegated words to a very inferior place in his operatic synthesis of the arts.»

¹ H. R. Roemer, Probleme der Hafizforschung und der Stand ihrer Lösung, p. 108.

² Der Islam, 1952: 2/3. W. Lentz, Beobachtungen über den Gedanklichen Aufbau einiger zeitgenössischer persischer Prosastücke.

We have already mentioned that modern European literature bears signs of a process leading to similar results. The phenomena are undoubtedly analogical, although there is no direct influence of the Persians on the European moderns except in Russia.¹

In *The Art of Paul Valéry*² Francis Scarfe mentions that in Valéry's own opinion the aspiration towards pure poetry is most successfully expressed in the last eight lines of the poem *Fragments du Narcisse*. Scarfe says (p. 65):

»We are fortunate in having an actual example of what Valéry considered to be this 'perfection of union', this state of 'pure' poetry sustained for only a few lines, in which the 'Paradise of Language' (an idea taken from Leonardo's view of mechanics as the 'paradise of the mathematical sciences') was achieved, as he thought, by Valéry himself. With regard to eight lines from the *Fragments du Narcisse* which were quoted by M. Jean de Latour, Valéry remarked: 'Les huit derniers vers que vous citez là sont très précisément ceux qui m'ont coûté le plus de travail, et que je considère comme les plus parfaits de tous ceux que j'ai écrits, je veux dire les plus conformes à ce que j'avais voulu qu'ils fussent, assouplis à toutes les contraintes que je leur avais assignées. Notez qu'ils sont, par ailleurs, absolument vides d'idées, et atteignent ainsi à ce degré de pureté qui constitue justement ce que je nomme poésie pure.'

The eight lines are as follows:

O douceur de survivre à la force du jour,
Quand elle se retire enfin rose d'amour,
Encore un peu brûlante, et lasse, mais comblée,
Et de tant de trésors tendrement accablée

¹ M. Zand, *Six Centuries of Glory*: »The nineteenth century Russian poet Fet was infatuated with Hafiz which resulted in many subtly conceived renderings and imitations of Hafiz's poems, and similar feelings flared up once more in early XX century Russian poetry, when M. Kuzmin, Vyacheslav Ivanov, V. Bryussov and others created ghazals inspired by motifs from Hafiz. This early century Russian 'Hafiziana' actually links up with Yesenin's 'Persian motifs', . . . » P. 141. It may be mentioned that Fet was regarded by the Russian symbolists as a precursor to their way of writing. On pp. 90—91, 104—105 I shall show how the stylistic ideals of Hâfiz, Goethe and Eliot link up with each other.

² Francis Scarfe, *The Art of Paul Valéry*, London 1954.

Par de tels souvenirs qu'ils empourprent sa mort,
 Et qu'ils la font heureuse agenouiller dans l'or,
 Puis s'étendre, se fondre, et perdre sa vendange,
 Et s'éteindre en un songe en qui le soir se change.»

We could hardly have a clearer expression of the programme of lack of clarity of thought in poetry.

Other poems could be quoted, even from the works of Mallarmé, Valéry's predecessor and spiritual father, which show the same purity as the incomparable eight final lines of *Fragments du Narcisse* quoted above. To take only one example:

Petit air

Quelconque une solitude
 Sans le cygne, ni le quai
 Mire sa désuétude
 Au regard que j'abdiquai

Ici de la gloriolle
 Haute à ne la pas toucher
 Dont maint ciel se bariole
 Avec les ors de coucher

Mais langoureusement longe
 Comme de blanc linge ôté
 Tel fugace oiseau si plonge
 Exultatrice à côté

Dans l'onde toi devenue
 Ta jubilation nue.¹

It is hardly possible to paraphrase the eight lines from the *Fragments du Narcisse*. As Valéry notes they are 'absolument vides d'idées'. The structure of a poem², according to John Crowe Ransom, is ». . . the framework of meaning, the prose argument within the

¹ The Poems of Mallarmé, London 1956, p. 98.

² Poetry, 73: 5, 1949, W. Elton, A Glossary of the New Criticism.

poem . . . ». If we consider only this definition, Valéry's poem has no structure. In this respect it differs from the poem of Ḥāfiẓ, *āhū-ye vaḥṣī*, which we shall try to analyse later. Ḥāfiẓ' poem has no plot but a kind of »relationship among episodes»¹ can be established. As regards the *Petit air* which I have quoted R. G. Cohn has² given a paraphrase which seems a bit arbitrary. In my view this poem of Mallarmé could as well depict the birth of Venus as a promenade of Mallarmé with his mistress.

Iqbal would probably have also condemned this form of Westernism, of Occidental modernism. In him the cogitative function is exceedingly well developed for one whose main occupation was that of the poet. In his usual terse manner, Iqbal would probably have condemned modernism as a cancer of Europe, poetry that excites the aesthetic curiosity with its poison but paralyzes all other intellectual functions.

Iqbal died in 1938, so it is strange that he never really noticed Occidental modernism. It is, on the whole, a matter for wonder how little mention he makes of poets in his own numerous poems which deal with Hegel, Nietzsche, Kitchener, Lenin, Bergson, the learned men of Punjab, etc. He did, it is true, publish a book dedicated to Goethe, *Payām-e Mašriq*. We must admit that Rückert's *Östliche Rosen*, Bodenstedt's *Lieder des Mirza Schaffy* and many others are less interesting imitations of *West-östlicher Divan* than this new Eastern appraisal. Still, Iqbal's over-simplifying, philosophic mode of observation in *Payām-e Mašriq* is — if compared with the sensibility of the original — often as blunt as Kasravī's.

This brings us to Iqbal's limitation. He could never truly understand Goethe's spontaneous delight in the poetry of Ḥāfiẓ, the ambiguous, elusive mysticism of *West-östlicher Divan*, nor the significance of his ponderings on the problems of Persian poetry in his collection of maxims *Noten und Abhandlungen zu besserem Verständnis des West-östlichen Divans*. Iqbal saw in Goethe a propagandist of that Eastern sphere of culture of which he himself was a part.

A poet of whom Iqbal spontaneously approved was Rūmī, whom he took with him on a trip to the *Secrets of the Self*, and who is his

¹ W. Elton, *A Glossary of the New Criticism*, Poetry 73: 5, p. 302.

² *Toward the poems of Mallarmé*, Berkeley 1965, pp. 117—118.

guide in the book *Ġāvīd nāme*. But Rūmī was a poet-philosopher, like Iqbal himself. Iqbal could spare no unambiguous admiration for lyric poets.

It is already in a sense established that Ḥāfiz' poems display discontinuity of thought. According to tradition, his most important patron Šāh Šuġā' considered his poems disjointed. Ḥāfiz' technical reforms were continued by the representatives of the 'Indian style', such as Bīdil and Ġālib, both of them poets born in India. In the 16th century the centre of Persian poetry moved to India, remaining there into the 19th century.

Indian critics give Muhammad Iqbal, the great Persian poet of our century, the credit for restoring continuity of thought to the ghazal. Despite his importance, he is very little known to modern Iranians. This means that they have never become aware of the discontinuity of the post-Ḥāfizian ghazal by drawing the comparison with the taut ghazals of Iqbal. Aḥmad Kasravī stands alone in Iran proper as having noticed the discontinuity of Ḥāfiz' poems.

The enthusiastic attempts of R. Lescot and M. Wickens to prove that Ḥāfiz' poems are clear constitute an indirect indication that they must be of less than perfect clarity.

None, however, has ever tried to prove the relative obscurity of Ḥāfiz' poems by comparing them with the traditional poetic style of Persia. It may be useful to attempt such a comparison.

Let us begin with one of Ḥāfiz' poems, showing a continuity of thought. Reuben Levy criticizes Ḥāfiz for his lack of speculative profundity,¹ clearly meaning that Ḥāfiz' poems never offer such brilliant (and continuous) passages of thought as those of Rūmī and 'Aṭṭār. Levy approves of the following poem, however, for its philosophical speculations.

1. dar azal partov-e ḥusnat ze taġallī dam zad
 'ešq paidā šud o āteš bahama 'ālam zad
2. ġalvaī kard ruḥat dīd malak 'ešq nadāšt
 'ein-e ātaš šud azīn ġeirāt o bar ādam zad
3. 'aql mīḥāst keze ān šo'le čerāġ afrūzad
 barq-e ġeirāt bederaḥšīd o ġahān barham zad

¹ R. Levy, *The Persian Language*, London 1951, p. 86.

4. mudda'ī ḥāst ke āyad betamāšāgah-e rāz
 dast-e ḡeib āmad o dar sīna-ye nāmaḥram zad
 5. dīgarān qor'a-ye qīsmat hama bar 'eīš zadand
 dil-e ḡamdīda-ye mā būd ke ham bar ḡam zad
 6. ḡān-e 'olvā havas-e čāh-e zanaḥdān-e to dāšt
 dast dar ḥalqa-ye ān zulf ḥam andar ḥam zad
 7. Ḥāfīz ān rūz ṭarabnāme-ye 'ešq-e to nivīšt
 ke qalam bar sar-e asbāb-e dil-e ḥurram zad

1. In eternity past the ray of your beauty breathed of its unveiling;
 Thus was love revealed and the world set ablaze.
2. Your visage created glory; the Angel saw but conceived no love;
 Thereby incensed he became the essence of fire and struck down
 at Man.
3. Reason desired to kindle a torch at the flame;
 There flashed forth the lightning of jealousy so that the world was
 destroyed.
4. The Adversary desired then to visit the place where secret things
 are visible;
 The hand of the Mysterious came and pierced the breast of that
 uninitiated one.
5. Others threw the die of Fate desiring only joy;
 'Twas my grief-stricken heart alone which threw for grief again.
6. From on high the soul held a passion for the dimple in your chin;
 Its hand dallied with those curling tresses of yours.
7. Ḥāfīz wrote the happy scroll of his love for you that day
 When he proscribed all things else which make the heart rejoice.¹

This poem proceeds clearly from the dawn of eternity to the curls of the beloved. Its progress is not, perhaps, in an absolutely straight line. The continuity here is that of a philosophic continuity of thought, and does not depend on associations.

We must now turn to a very different kind of poem. The logical coherence of the previous example is overthrown and instead we have an entity consisting of disconnected couplets, even of disconnected episodes. The following poem, in fact, consists of several poems linked by a loose chain of associations. I have used A. J. Arberry's

¹ Translation by Reuben Levy, *The Persian Language*, pp. 87–88.

version, from his *Fifty Poems of Ḥāfiẓ*,¹ which differs considerably from the version of Rosenzweig-Schwannau. For example, Arberry's version lacks a whole poem within the poem. This is the part in the Hammer translation² dealing with the horn sounding in the valley. The sound of this horn indicates that again a man is killed for the sake of a single grain of corn. Arberry has a good division of the different parts of the poem into individual pieces.³

1. alā ey āhū-ye vaḥṣī kuḡāī
marā bā tūst bisyār āšnāī
2. do tanhā rou do sargardān-e bīkas
do rāh ast ō kamīn az pīš o az pas
3. be-yā tā ḡāl-e yekdīgar bedānīm
murād ham beḡūīm ar tavānīm
4. ke mībīnam ke īn dašt-e mušavvaš
čarāḡāhī nadārad eiman ō ḡwaš

5. ke ḡāhad šud begūīd ey ḡabībān
rafīq-e bīkasān yār-e ḡarībān
6. magar ḡeḡr-e mubāarak pey dar āyad
ze yumn-e himmataš īn rah sar āyad

7. nakard ān hamdam-e dīrīn mudārā
musalmānān musalmānān ḡudārā
8. čenīn bīraḡm zad zaḡm-e ḡudāī
ke ḡūī ḡod nabūdast āšnāī
9. beraft ō ḡab'-e ḡošbāšam ḡazīn kard
berādar bā berādar key čenīn kard
10. magar ḡeḡr-e mubāarak pey tavānad
ke īn tanhā bedān tanhā rasānad

¹ A. J. Arberry, *Fifty Poems of Ḥāfiẓ*, Cambridge 1953, p. 78.

² Joseph v. Hammer, *Der Diwan von Mohammed Schemsed-din Hafis*, 2. Theil, p. 480.

³ Even other parts of the poem as given in Arberry's anthology are in a very different order in Rosenzweig-Schwannau's edition. This is a typical situation which we come across while reading different editions. It does not make studies on Ḥāfiẓ' poems any easier.

11. magar vaqt-e 'aṭā parvardan āmad
ke fālam lā taḍarnī fardan āmad
12. ke rūzī rahrovī dar sarzamīnī
be luṭfaš guft rend-e rahnišīnī
13. ke ey sālek če dar anbāne dārī
be-yā dāmī beneh gar dāne dārī
14. ġavābaš dād o guftā dāne dāram
valī sīmurġ mībāyad šekāram
15. beguftā čūn be dast ārī nišānaš
ke az mā bīnišān ast āšyānaš
16. neyāz-e mā če vazn ārad bedīn sāz
ke ḥuršīd-e ġanī šud kīse pardāz

17. ču ān sarv-e sahī šud kārvānī
ze bāl-e sarv mīkun dīdabānī
18. lab-e sarčasme'ī ō ṭarf-e ġūī
nam-e aškī o bā ḥod guftogūī
19. be yād-e raftagān ō dūstdārān
muvāfiq gard bā abr-e bahārān
20. ču nālān āyadat āb-e ravān piš
madad baḥšaš ze āb-e dīda-ye ḥwīš
21. madeh ġām-e mey ō pāy-e gul az dast
valī ġāfil mabāš az dahr-e badmast
22. rafīqān qadr-e yakdīgar bedānīd
ču ma'lūm ast šarḥ az bar beḥānīd
23. maqālāt-e našīḥatgū hamīn ast
ke ḥukmandāz-e heġrān dar kamīn ast

24. ču māhī-ī kalak āram be taqrīr
to az nūn va 'l-qalam mīpurs tafsīr
25. ravān-rā bā ḥerad darḥam sirištam
vaz ān toḥmī ke ḥāšil būd kištam
26. faraḥbaḥšī dar īn tarkīb peydāst
ke maġz-e še'r-e naġzaš ġān-e aġzāst
27. be-yā vaz nikhat-e īn ṭīb-e omīd
mešām-e ġān mu'aṭṭar sāz ġāvīd
28. ke īn nāfe ze čīn-e ġīb-e ḥūr ast
na zān āhū ke az mardum nafūr ast

1. Oh wild deer, where are you?
Well known are you to me.
2. Two people, walking, alone, two lost ones, solitary,
there are two paths but ambush lies in front and behind.
3. Come, let us know each other's condition
and let us seek what we desire, if we can.
4. For I see that in this restless desert
there is no safe and pleasant pasture

5. Who will be, tell me my friends,
the companion of the lonely, the helper of the stranger.
6. If only the holy ḥeḍr should appear,
this journey would come to an end by his auspicious care.

7. That long-time bosom friend was ungentle,
O Moslems, O Moslems, my God.
8. He struck me so cruelly by the separation,
that one should say there never was any acquaintance.
9. He went, making my glad mind heavy,
when did a brother behave so to a brother?
10. May the holy ḥeḍr enable
this lonely one to meet that lonely one.

11. The time may have come when I receive the mercy
that the prayer 'don't leave me solitary' has been heard.
12. One day, the wayfarer in a far country
was kindly told by a wise man who sat by the wayside.
13. O wayfarer, what is in your bag?
Come, lay down your trap if you have seeds.
14. His answer was, I have seeds
but I must hunt the sīmurḡ.
15. He said, how can you learn its whereabouts
for we have no knowledge of its nest.
16. What is the use of our begging any more
when the rich sun has become a purser.

17. When that straight cypress became a mark for caravans,
by the cypress bough you must be guided.

18. On the edge of a spring, nearby a stream,
with a tear, with soliloquy,
19. In the memory of the dead and friends
be like a springtime cloud.
20. When water bursts forth before you, lamenting,
help it with the water of your eyes.
21. Do not abandon the glass of wine, the nearness of flowers,
do not neglect the drunken world.
22. O friends, recognize each other's worth
when the explanation is clear then learn it by heart.
23. This is the essay of the counsellor
but the one who commands separation lies in ambush.

24. When I make the fish speak and intrigue
ask from the fish and the pen the explanation.
25. The soul and the intellect I kneaded
and sowed the seed for that mixture.
26. Pleasant things sprang from that mixture,
the pith of its sweet poem is the soul of the limbs.
27. Come for the scent of good hope,
let the soul be eternally perfumed.
28. This musk is from the fold of a houri's pocket
not from that deer which shuns men.

In the first part the poet complains that his wild deer is lost and now he is alone. There are ambushes before and behind, and the disconsolate poet has no safe place of repose.

In the second sequence the poet complains that his bosom friend has treated him badly, causing them to part.

The third part of the poem is surprising, and in fact forms a separate story. Here the poet tells how the wayfarer has travelled to a strange country, where he meets a wise freethinker. This wise one tells him to settle down in the strange country and trap game. The wayfarer answers that his quarry is the *sīmurġ* bird, seen only by mystics, which leads the mystics, the Sufis, on their road towards nirvana (*fanā* in Persian).

Here the poem which began as a lament for the lost beloved aspires to new height. The beloved is elliptically compared with the *sīmurġ*

bird of the mystical tales. Now that the object of love is thus given a new form, it becomes linked with a platonistic conception of love displaying itself on several levels.

Yet this sudden, unexpected tale of the wayfarer and the sage puzzles the reader. He may wonder where this poem within a poem has come from, this section that could in fact be presented as a separate *maṭnavī*.

Here we are reminded of an idea expressed by the Russian formalist Viktor Shklovski. Shklovski is one of the main critics of the Russian formalist school of the period from 1915 to the end of the 1920s. This school was completely destroyed in Russia in the 1930s, and later was held in very bad repute.¹ Shklovski expresses his idea mainly to defend modern Russian poetry. He thinks that the more the images and sequences of a poem astound, the greater the effect of a poem. The effect of the poem is directly related to the power of its parts to startle. However, this startling quality must not be completely separate from the rest of the poem. A poem is not good without something binding the parts accurately together. To Shklovski, the associations of the images provide sufficient ties.²

The different parts of the poem *āhū-ye vaḥṣī* are a good proof of Shklovski's theories. The line: *Magar vaqt-e 'atā parvardan āmad* starts a sequence which appears to have no connection with the rest of the poem. And yet it is this very sequence and its strangeness that gives the poem its point of elevation. The whole tale of the wayfarer is separate from the general course of the poem. It is connected by the first couplet:

Magar vaqt-e 'atā parvardan āmad
ke fālam lā taḍarnī fardan āmad

[The time may have come when I receive the mercy
that the prayer 'don't leave me solitary' has been
heard.]

¹ More about Shklovski and his collaborators in Victor Erlich's *Russian formalism*, Leiden 1955, and Henry Parland, *Den modernistiska dikten ur formalistisk synpunkt*, Återsken, pp. 102–110, Helsingfors 1932.

² Henry Parland, *Återsken*, Helsingfors 1932, p. 105.

This couplet has the theme of solitude that is repeated in the poem. Thus it ties the sequence to the rest of the poem.

The next sequence describes a theme quite common in Persian lyric poetry, but here it seems to be rather detached from the rest. The poet is in a garden by a river. There are blooming trees and flowing water, so precious in Persia. It is spring. Now there comes a break in the idyllic *nem-e aškī o bā ḥod guftogūī*.

In a joyous Persian spring poem the poet seldom soliloquizes. There are always merry companions to share the wine-bowl with him.

Here we find a new aspect in Ḥāfiẓ' poetry. In the 1940s, Qāsem Ġanī published his epoch-making work *Bah̄ dar āḡār va afkār va aḥvāl-e Ḥāfiẓ*,¹ to be followed by Roger Lescot's study based on it.² In this, the foundations laid by Ġanī enabled him to date many of Ḥāfiẓ' poems. This dating had never been done before.

Lescot noted that *ma'sūq* and *mamdūḥ* were often mixed in Ḥāfiẓ' poems, that is, Ḥāfiẓ united two different experiences into one conception.

I here refer to Q. Ġanī's section on Ḥāfiẓ' *heḡrān* period. This is marked by a plaintive tone which is otherwise rather rare in Ḥāfiẓ. He can on occasion be heart-breakingly tragic, but he is rarely sorrowful. Q. Ġanī has dated some of the poems which undoubtedly belong to Ḥāfiẓ' middle period. The mention of Abū'l-favāris Šāh Šuḡā' or his alias Šāh Suvār, proves that the poems quoted by Ġanī and Lescot do indeed belong to this period. They are marked by a unique sorrowful tone, a plaintive sadness.³

The *maṭnavī* now under discussion does not mention the name of Abū'l-favāris or of Šāh Suvār. Nevertheless, the sad tone dominating the poem is related to the poems of Ḥāfiẓ' *heḡrān* period. Never before has Ḥāfiẓ been so melancholic. It is possible that *āḥū-ye vaḥšī* be-

¹ Tehrān 1943.

² R. Lescot, *Essai d'une chronologie de l'oeuvre de Ḥāfiẓ*, *Bulletin d'études orientales*, T. 10, Beyrouth 1944.

³ H. Roemer, *Probleme der Hafizforschung und der Stand ihrer Lösung*, p. 112. »Hafiz ist in Ungnade gefallen und führt darüber bewegte Klage. Seine Freunde haben ihn verlassen, Feinde intrigieren gegen ihn . . . Als er aber schliesslich doch nach Jazd gereist war, ergreift ihn das Heimweh nach Širāz, wobei nichterfüllte Hoffnungen auf Fürstengunst eine Rolle spielen mögen.»

longs to the *heġrān* period¹ during which Ḥāfiẓ, conscious of his greatness, wrote for the whole continent. This is shown by his poem in which he tells how his one-night-old child (the poem) made the year-long trip from Persia to Bengal.²

If we assume that our *maḥnavī*, *āhū-ye vaḥṣī*, reflects the happenings of the *heġrān* period then the basic thought of the sequence in question fits into our theme well. The poet is alone in his garden because his friend and, more importantly, patron Šāh Šuġā' is not present. This garden sequence, again, is connected with the rest of the poem by association. For the sake of logical continuity the scene in the garden has nothing to do with the rest of the poem. The associative link is in the theme of the loss of the beloved recurring in different parts of the poem.

How can we connect with the whole the sequence beginning with the couplet, »When I make the fish to speak and to intrigue?»

There is no connection here with what has gone before. The only image providing a link with the rest of the poem is the last couplet:

ke īn nāfe ze čīn-e ġīb-e hūr ast
na zān āhū ke az mardum nafūr ast

[This musk is from the fold of a houri's pocket,
not from that deer which shuns men.]

In the last line we have another mention of the gazelle who hates people. This thus connects the whole poem in its link with the first line, *Alā ey āhū-ye vaḥṣī kuġāī*.

In many ways, this last couplet is typical of Ḥāfiẓ. It is especially typical of his final lines because here, as in so many of his poems, the whole is raised to a new peak. The culmination creates its effect because the poem comes full circle, returning to the theme of the opening lines, and because Ḥāfiẓ here returns to one of his favourite themes, mysticism. He returns to paradise from whence the musk

¹ All the elements of the mood of this period are there. There is the »bewegte Klage», in the poem we see in many passages that his friend has left him, already in the beginning of the poem we read that his foes intrigue against him, there is even »das Heimweh nach Šīrāz» to be felt, even if the name of Šīrāz is not mentioned.

² Kīn ʔeḥl-e yakšaba rah-e yaksāle mīravād.

of poetry has been brought, and thereby once again heightens the power of the poem. Yet again, Ḥāfiẓ leaves us wondering how seriously to take his mysticism. Ḥāfiẓ' last lines often reflect rhythmic — or perhaps we should say phonetic — talent as well. The eloquent rhythm gives a new meaning to plain words. This is true of the whole poem and of Ḥāfiẓ' poetry in general. It is impossible to analyze without awareness of his rhythmic magnetism that completely changes the tone of lines borrowed from older poets.