Ḥāfiẓ and Goethe's Noten und Abhandlungen zu besserem Verständnis des West-östlichen Divans.

A synopsis of the study.

It is interesting to note the great variety of methods applied in the study of Ḥāfiẓ' poetry. H. Schaeder, for example, talks of a system of *Leitmotivs*.[1] A. J. Arberry, too, turns to music for his terminology with such expressions as 'contrapuntal technique'. The name of G. M. Wickens' focal theory is reminiscent of optics.

W. Lentz' remark that »Der Iranist steht gegenüber dem Werk des Hafis vor einem Berg von ungelösten Aufgaben» (p. vii) is not without point. Like Schaeder, Lentz has been led to explain the difficult relationship of Ḥāfiẓ and Goethe's *West-östlicher Divan* with philosophical theories of his own. Goethe's *Noten und Abhandlungen* are written in a conversational style, as Lentz points out (p. 89), and even here it is very difficult to define the meaning which is hidden in them and to find a clear-cut, unambiguous picture of Ḥāfiẓ.

It seems a little strange, perhaps, that none of these scholars whose interest has been caught by Ḥāfiẓ or *West-östlicher Divan* has shown awareness of the fact that for a century, since about 1860, there has been difficult poetry in Europe. No small numbers of intelligent men have developed tools specifically for the explanation and clarification of this difficult poetry; there are, indeed, schools of thought concentrated on this.

René Wellek[2] divides the trends of criticism in the twentieth century into six main categories: »(1) Marxist criticism, (2) psycho-

---

[1] W. Lentz, Goethes Noten und Abhandlungen zum West-östlichen Divan, Hamburg 1958, p. 36.

[2] Concepts of Criticism, New Haven 1965, pp. 345—346.

analytic criticism, (3) linguistic and stylistic criticism, (4) a new organistic formalism, (5) myth criticism appealing to the results of cultural anthropology and the speculations of Carl Jung, and (6) what amounts to a new philosophical criticism inspired by existentialism and kindred world views.» Wellek notes that the order in which he has mentioned the trends is roughly chronological.

In my two studies my views have been gathered mainly from Wellek's category 4. Critics like B. Croce, I. A. Richards, Paul Valéry, T. S. Eliot and American new critics like John Crowe Ransom, Allen Tate, Cleanth Brooks come into the category of organistic formalism. Some of my ideas come from the Russian formalists whom Wellek puts in category 3.

Hans Heinrich Schaeder and Wolfgang Lentz are the two authors demanding reconsideration during my study of Goethe's *Noten und Abhandlungen*. Both of them make the *Noten* into a system. Lentz, who has made the closest reading, informs us that Goethe himself has avoided any systematic presentation of his material (pp. 53, 75, 91, 134). Let us refer to Goethe: ». . . obgleich diese Verfahrensart mehr zu eigner Belehrung, Unterhaltung und Massregel, als zum Unterricht anderer geeignet seyn mag . . .» (Naturformen der Dichtung). Goethe has deliberately avoided the systematic method, reserving the rights and the freedom of a conversationalist. Yet conceptual explication of Goethe's ideas is, needless to say, justified.

Schaeder has succeeded in brilliantly clarifying Goethe's ideas about Ḥāfiẓ, particularly Ḥāfiẓ' detachment from both alcohol and mysticism. In connection with Ḥāfiẓ, Goethe and Schaeder give new contents to the ambiguity wine/mysticism. Goethe as expounded by Schaeder adds to this ambiguity the concept of harmony between the opposites which he thinks was the stylistic ideal of Ḥāfiẓ. The meaning of this supreme harmony is that we cannot distinguish between the wine and the mysticism in Ḥāfiẓ' poems. Schaeder's commentary is well-documented and its simple, lucid style inspires the reader to further study. It is, in fact, the source of inspiration of the present work. Wolfgang Lentz, the well-known German Iranian scholar, has taken the same work of Goethe and produced a *Goethebild* that in many ways differs from that of Schaeder.

Lentz is apparently going back to his former idea presented in *Beobachtungen über den gedanklichen Aufbau einiger zeitgenössischer*

persischer Prosastücke.[1] He is conveying the idea that Goethe uses the same incoherent »gedankliche Aufbau» as the Persian prose style. In approaching Goethe, Lentz' old idea of the Persian style (see p. 19 of this work) has been added to considerably. His linking of the style of the *West-östlicher Divan* and the Persian literary style is completely convincing.

Lentz' study is concerned with the structure of the *Noten und Abhandlungen* although there seems to be no direct contact with the structural methods which Wellek lists.[2] According to Lentz the two poles of *Noten und Abhandlungen* are the studies of *Israel in der Wüste* and *Der künftige Divan.*[3] The first is a scholarly study and the second a free imaginative display of ideas about Ḥāfiẓ, Persian poetry and Oriental culture in general. On his findings in the structure of *Noten und Abhandlungen* Lentz builds his ideas about Goethes philosophical system which according to him is inherent in this work. Lentz has arranged the different elements in Goethe's *Weltansicht* into an ingenious hierarchic order and has represented this hierarchy in the form of detailed diagrams. Lentz' method of representation is marked by a very strict observance of the division in categories which he has set before him. Sometimes the results of the study do not arise from the system, important insights are found in subordinate clauses as well as in the main clauses printed in bold type. Lentz' ideas of Goethe's philosophic and aesthetic views in *Noten und Abhandlungen* corroborate the trends of 20th-century Goethe studies. Polarity (which Lentz calls *Oppositionsreihen*, p. 122 and 129), morphology of primary forms and genres that occur and recur in different times and places, these are important topics of present-day Goethe studies.[4]

In Lentz' book these topics are illuminated by strictly adhering to Goethe's text. The new aesthetics of Persian literature, which according to Lentz (pp. 39, 94, 148, 152) is to be found in Goethe's *Noten und Abhandlungen*, does not emerge quite clearly. In the

[1] *Islam*, 1925.

[2] Concepts of Criticism, p. 345.

[3] W. Lentz, Goethes Noten und Abhandlungen zum West-östlichen Divan, p. 149.

[4] H. Kindermann, Das Goethebild des 20. Jahrhunderts, p. 597 ff., p. 646 ff.

summary on page 152 this aesthetics appears understandably in a curtailed form and is presented elsewhere in the book with more variety. »Er findet auf dem Gebiete a) der persischen literarischen Ästhetik unter der Oberfläche *rhetorischer Verstellung* einen unsystematischen, motivischen, assoziativen Kompositionstyp mit Hafis als bedeutendstem Vertreter.[1] The »*Hafis-Typ*» is not the only aspect of Persian literary aesthetics which Goethe discusses in his *Noten und Abhandlungen*. Other aspects would be e.g. Schaeder's views on Goethe and Ḥāfiẓ, and the discussion on the nature of the Persian metaphors in the chapter *Allgemeines*.

To proceed to my own commentary, I intend to explain matters in the order in which Goethe has found them. This method has its merits, it is commonly used when commenting on Goethe's works.

Goethe's oriental studies are presented in a form stylistically somewhere between a scholarly work and a private notebook. If we compare the results of Goethe's studies with those of some contemporary oriental studies, we can say that he was an orientalist in his own right.

What remains valid today of v. Hammer's massive output of over a hundred volumes? In *Arabischen Studien in Europa* J. Fück states that its only importance now lies in the history of the administration of the Ottoman Empire (p. 165). The descriptions of writers given in Hammer's seven-volume *Geschichte der Arabischen Literatur* are enough to show us the difference between Hammer and Goethe. They are monotonous and stereotyped, and give no idea of the personalities or style of the thousands of poets described. Goethe, by contrast, attempts to show the differing aspects of the Persian poets he discussed. He goes even further when speaking of Ḥāfiẓ. Goethe's view of the equilibrium between the mystic and the realistic side in Ḥāfiẓ' poetry carries great aesthetic weight. Through the picture he gives of Ḥāfiẓ, Goethe lets us see his idea of a perfect poet.

Emerson's thoughts on Ḥāfiẓ strengthen this idea of equilibrium, although his formulations are less clear in this respect than those of Goethe.

Schaeder showed, in his *Goethe's Erlebnis des Ostens*, that Goethe's

[1] W. Lentz, Goethes Noten und Abhandlungen zum West-östlichen Divan, p. 152.

idea of Ḥāfiẓ was that a dismissal of Ḥāfiẓ as a sufi or an epicurean wine-bibber is a disruption of his stylistic aims. The ambiguity was brought about quite consciously.

Since Roger Lescot's *Essai d'une chronologie de l'oeuvre de Ḥāfiẓ*, further types of Ḥāfizian ambiguity have emerged. We can now say, if we wish, that Ḥāfiẓ made a mess of panegyrical, political and love poetry, as well as of the mystic and realistic kinds. There may even be other forms of Ḥāfiẓian ambiguity still to be unearthed.

All these facets of Ḥāfiẓ fit well with Goethe's original idea of the equilibrium or supreme wit of this poet. Goethe's ideas on Ḥāfiẓ prove still valid. When we think of the men whom Goethe described as his teachers, who helped him in his oriental studies — Diez, Eichhorn, Lorsbach, Kosegarten — we cannot but say that Goethe the pupil, though not usually regarded as an orientalist, has made a more lasting contribution to oriental studies than his teachers.

The later orientalist may be dissatisfied with some of Goethe's views on the Orient. His views were sometimes biased, and the list of the books on the Orient that he never read, with my analysis of his *Noten und Abhandlungen*, should indicate where the bias lay.

One striking example of Goethe's lack of objectivity is his opinion of India. In the chapter *Neuere und neuste Reisende*, he speaks of the 'abstruser Mysticismus' of India. In the chapter *Geschichte* he likewise speaks slightingly of India.[1] It cannot even be claimed that Goethe's views on India would have benefited by further reading. Studying the catalogue of his private library, his borrowings from the Weimarer Bibliothek, and points in his own work that touch on the subject, we have to admit that he should have been able, judging on this basis, to have formed a fair picture of India. Nor is this the only shortcoming. The Persian mystical poets, in particular Rūmī, do not receive their due.

Goethe has achieved lasting results by approaching the problems of Ḥāfiẓ' poetry as acutely as, say, a German writing about French literature or vice versa. He has approached the problems with a penetration which was very rare in Oriental studies of his time.

In talking of Ḥāfiẓ as his ideal poet, Goethe not only adds depth to his own aesthetic principles, not only makes an outstanding

[1] West-östlicher Divan, hrsg. von Hans-J. Weitz, Wiesbaden 1951, p. 133.

contribution to Persian studies, but also strengthens and deepens the cultural ties of East and West.

*

Of the Persian classics, Ḥāfiẓ is the best known and the most authoritatively treated in the field of European orientalism and translation. However, since Fitzgerald's publication of his well-known version of 'Omar Ḫayyām's quatrains, Ḫayyām literature has grown until the number of studies and translations may even have outstripped corresponding works on Ḥāfiẓ. The publication of this type of literature is based on the demands of the reading public, dependent less on the actual poems of 'Omar than on Fitzgerald's brilliant versions of them.

Until Fitzgerald discovered him, 'Omar was little known as a poet, not only in Europe but also in his own country.[1] On the other hand,

[1] »Als persischen Dichter erwähnen ihn die ältesten Quellen überhaupt nicht. Die Zeitgenossen hielten seine Poesie wohl für das Geringste, wodurch er sich auszeichnete.» J. Rypka, Iranische Literaturgeschichte, 1959, p. 222.

Ḥāfiẓ had no 'discoverer' such as Fitzgerald to translate his poems and spread his fame throughout Europe. Instead, such studies and translations as exist are inspired solely by the integral merits of Ḥāfiẓ' poetry. The factors which effect publication of edition after edition of 'Omar's works in translation, while preserving Ḥāfiẓ as the delicacy of a few fortunates, are not far to seek. 'Omar's scepticism and pessimism, the brevity with which they are expressed, are immediately comprehensible and enjoyable, making no demand for deep knowledge of Persian poetic terminology. They are the fruits of a great scholar's sophisticated pastime, composed to give his moods free rein, rather than the work of a professional poet. As such they are unique in Persian literature. A. J. Arberry has suggested that 'Omar's quatrains may well have been written and circulated in secret, without the knowledge of the public guards of orthodoxy.[1]

This was not the case with Ḥāfiẓ. He could scarcely have afforded such writing; his ghazals were his work. Closely connected with the poetic tradition already familiar to the public, they nevertheless transformed tradition and read with refreshing novelty. All the generally familiar cultural knowledge of the period is found skilfully indicated in Ḥāfiẓ' metaphors. 'Omar's poetry is closer to the simple lyrical form, which can be understood with no knowledge of cultural history and poetics. Ḥāfiẓ, by contrast, was in the main stream of Persian poetry, making use of all the technique of that poetry; inevitably, he suffers in translation. The rules of Persian poetry are a law unto themselves, and extremely difficult to transplant to another cultural sphere in enjoyable form.

---

[1] »... on the other hand it is possible that he feared to commit to paper his original findings in metaphysics, though he was famed as a follower of Avicenna, because he judged the times were not propitious for broadcasting opinions contrary to strict orthodoxy. In the latter event he would have satisfied himself with expressing his dangerous doubts in the only medium open to him, occasional Persian verses recited to amuse an intimate circle of faithful friends and disciples...

... It was only when the purport of these exercises of wit became known to a wider public — by the whispering of his poems abroad and the amusement and delight with which they were greeted by his growing public — it was only then that he found himself confronted by the dread charge of infidelity, and took refuge in dissimulation to save his skin.» A. J. Arberry, Omar Khayyám, 1952, pp. 31—32.

Europe first heard of Ḥāfiẓ through the famous traveller Pietro Della Valle.[1] He touches lightly in different parts of his itinerary problems of Persian literature, thus becoming the first European connoisseur of this field, though in a limited sense only. Della Valle was a keen-eyed observer, and he mentions the cruelty of Persian habits at Šāh 'Abbās' court. He recounts that, like the Romans, the Persians have poets, and proceeds with angry snortings to describe the Persian style, repeating the same theme over and over again in slightly different terms. He even confesses that he himself has written poetry, not only in Italian, but also in Persian. This particular letter concludes with a two-page defence of his decision to stop writing poetry. Ḥāfiẓ receives his approbation, in the context of a visit to Shiraz and a description of Ḥāfiẓ' tomb. Praise indeed since, as Della Valle states in his letter of June 1622, he is usually certain of the superiority of European literature.

It was to take another century and a half before Europe began to recognize Ḥāfiẓ as one of the world's best poets. Even in the days of Della Valle, Meninski and Thomas Hyde, no clear picture had been formed of the literary treasures of the East.[2] The occasional references and translations were not enough to right the balance. In addition, thoughts were still ruled by the unadjustable contrast of Christian and Moslem. It was only after 1750 that Europe woke up to appreciation of the cultures of the East, and then no effort was spared. Representatives of this true humanism sprang up suddenly in many countries, but first and foremost in England, whose East India Company had made many of its employees into orientalists of the first water. William Jones, Chief Justice of Calcutta,[3] is typical of this period. His large output deals with problems of languages of the Near East, and his anthology *Poeseos Asiaticae commentariorum libri VI* (1774) was of great importance in spreading knowledge of Oriental literature. Such versatile Oriental linguists are a phenomenon peculiar to the period, never before encountered. The Austrian orientalist

---

[1] Della Valle returned from his voyage to the Orient in 1626. His itinerary was published in the form of 54 letters to his friend Mario Schipano in 1650—58.

[2] Meninski, Linguarum Orientalium Turcicae, Arabicae, Persicae institutiones, 1677. Thomas Hyde, Hyde's Miscellanea, 1767.

[3] Born in London 1746, died in Calcutta 1794.

Hammer-Purgstall [1] was a scholar in the field of Middle Eastern Literature, with a good knowledge of several Oriental languages; thus he could introduce the literature of these countries to the German-speaking public. He became the father of German orientalism, and his journal *Fundgruben des Orients* 1809—18, together with his Ḥāfiẓ translation, laid the foundation of that orientalist trend in German literature extending from Goethe to Hoffmannsthal. This general tropism to the east is also observable in Franz Bopp's discovery that Sanskrit and its descendants were related with the main European languages. This was one of the greatest linguistic discoveries of all times.

As during the Renaissance, contemporary literature played an essential part in broadening cultural scope. Fr. v. Schlegel, in the journal *Europa* (vol. 1, 1803), spoke of a new Renaissance, demanding a renewal of the arts stemming from the discovery of this hitherto unknown area of literature. The discovery did, indeed, contribute much to the rebirth of arts and sciences, reflected in the brilliant achievements of men such as Goethe and Franz Bopp.

In the earlier years of the eighteenth century there had been a kind of decorative orientalism. Montesquieu and Voltaire sometimes dressed their characters in oriental robes. A. Galland [2] made a successful translation of the *Arabian Nights*. This was a superficial gloss. Views of the Orient more worth consideration than Montesquieu's first appear in Germany, whose role it was to become conscious of the importance of the new trend. Straying for a moment into the dangerous forest of national characteristics, it may be thought typical that it was England that, in the race for new conquests in Asia, gained immediate local contact with these remote countries and thus could drink straight from the well. The information, after a preliminary sifting, was sent to Europe, where Germany worked out the meaning

[1] Born 1774, died 1856. Hammer was trained as an interpreter in Constantinople. He became Metternich's collaborator and worked in his chancellery from 1807. In 1847—49 he was president of the Wiener Akademie der Wissenschaften. Hammer, after 1835 Hammer-Purgstall, wrote massive works in the fields of Arabic, Persian and Turkish literature.

[2] Antoine Galland published his translation in 12 vols. in 1704—1717. His translation was reprinted frequently and translated into the main Western European languages.

of the information in a manner which has no like in England. Schlegel had his Utopian ideas, while Goethe and Herder had profound reflections on the cultural problems of the Orient.

Herder sought to release the literature of different nations and different classes from the studies of the specialists and bring them into the sphere of important human problems. Herder is the father of the concept of world literature, though Goethe was the first to use the term 'Weltliteratur'.[1]

The different literatures of the world were more to Herder than the sum of lifelong hobbies. They were his tools in the expansion of cultural knowledge to embrace new, broader views and the humanity hidden behind a stranger and more remote expression, as well as the familiar literatures of a man's native country and its neighbours. After Herder this expansion of literary history became a fact; the concept of world literature spread and was acknowledged, though not always remembered by the individual scholar.

To Herder, literature in all its forms was the realization of the idea of humanity. Literature and folk-lore have always existed to raise nations from brutality to civilization. Herder did more than form vague images of literaurtes to support these more general pedagogical ideas. His strength, at least in his youth, was his sensitiveness in appreciating national characteristics. His studies and collection of folk songs[2] bear witness to this.

Throughout his life Herder studied Oriental literature and aided its spread, although his only important results lay in his being able to penetrate the soul of Hebrew poetry.[3] These studies, and a translation of the *Song of Songs*,[4] stemmed from the years when he was drawn to search for and discover the variety of literary phenomena. In time his attitude became more ruled by principles and abstractions, and lost the seal of joy in discovery. In his prose works or translations Herder dealt with a vast sweep of Eastern literature, Arabic, Turkish,

---

[1] »Alle späteren Anthologien deutscher Herausgeber standen in seiner Schuld, und sein praktisches Beispiel bereitete die Beschäftigung Goethes und der frühromantischen Schule mit der 'Weltliteratur' vor». Alexander Gillies, Herder, 1949, p. 97.

[2] Volkslieder 1778—1779.

[3] Vom Geiste der ebräischen Poesie, 1782—1783.

[4] Lieder der Liebe, 1778.

Persian, Indian, Chinese. His source was usually some English translation. William Jones' *Poeseos Asiaticae comm. libri VI*, which was published in Latin in Germany in 1777, was the main source for Herder's only anthology of translated Orient poetry, *Blumen aus morgenländischen Dichtern gesammlet* (1792). The bulk of the anthology consists of translations from the Persian poet Sa'dī. Sa'dī was Ḥāfiẓ' most prominent predecessor. These translations are the result of Herder's fondness for Sa'dī's poems. In 1769 he praises Sa'dī in one of his letters, saying he knows his works by heart. Sa'dī had been translated into German in the seventeenth century, and Herder took a liking to him perhaps because of the comprehensiveness of his language in Gulistān, or his moralizing character which might have corresponded to the taste of the epoch. Herder mentions Sa'dī's name in his letters in connection with his working plans, but the anthology which is a work of his later years holds the only concrete results of these plans, results which do not do full justice to Sa'dī.

It is unfortunate that when Herder came to study Ḥāfiẓ he had already lost his liveliness and flexibility in the penetration of new and strange literary forms of expression. He leans more and more towards generalizations, abstractions, with nothing vital or enlivening, towards the other pole of his philosophy, the concept of world literature. He sees Sa'dī and Ḥāfiẓ with this overriding goal in mind. Sa'dī's moral advice won his favour, but: »An Hafyz Gesängen haben wir fast genug. Saadi ist uns lehrreicher gewesen.» Herder translated many of Sa'dī's poems and one of Ḥāfiẓ' (the first German translation) into German hexameters, in the collection *Blumen aus morgenländischen Dichtern gesammlet.* In the translations of his prime[1] the style was free, exploring the forms and spirit of the original language; his later translations are turned to dry classicism.

Wahl is usually credited with the first translations of Ḥāfiẓ.[2] However, Wahl simply published a collection of Ḥāfiẓ' poems in the original in his *Neue Arabische Anthologie.*[3] The honour of being the first translator from the original goes to Joseph von Hammer-Purgstall.

---

[1] E.g. in Volkslieder, 1778—1779, the most popular of his translations.

[2] H. Roemer, Probleme der Hafizforschung und der Stand ihrer Lösung, Akad. Wiss. u. Lit. in Mainz, Abh. d. Kl. Lit. 1951: 3, p. 98.

[3] Comp. Tschersig, 1907, Studien zu Graf Platens Gaselen, s. 23, Anm. I.

His *Diwan von Mohammed Schemsed-din Hafis*[1] gave the impetus to the avalanche of Ḥāfiẓian *joie-de-vivre* and pessimism that swept through German literature from Goethe to Hoffmannsthal's ghazals.

In his foreword, Hammer deals with that eternal bone of contention, the nature of Ḥāfiẓ' work. He is impartial in his views, defending neither the interpretations of the mystics nor those of the anacreonites. He remarks that the conception of Ḥāfiẓ' varying attitudes is not only plain in the different ghazals ». . . sondern dieselben Widersprüche, derselbe Absprung vom Wirklichen zum Allegorischen und vom Übersinnlichen zum Sinnlichen findet sich nicht selten in einem einzigen Gasele beysammen, und es erhellet daraus, dass Hafis also weder ganz sinnlich noch ganz allegorisch verstanden werden müsse . . .».[2]

One might almost say that in places Hammer's foreword sounds rather like Goethe, and may have been inspiring to Goethe as he read Hammer's *Diwan* with growing interest: ». . . entflogen ist dem Käficht der Vogel der Seele, und er trinkt Licht und Weisheit aus dem Quelle des ewigen Lebens, das ist, aus dem Quelle der ewigen Liebe.»[3] This 'ewige Liebe' of Hammer's is no ecstatic mystical vision of the Beyond, but fits well into Ḥāfiẓ' world, while also being quite typical of Goethe.

The following extract is a good example of the fresh touch Hammer's translations often reveal:

Sage Morgenwind mit Schmeicheln
Jener lieblichen Gaselle,
Auf die Berge, in die Wüsten
Hat die Liebe mich getrieben.

Warum frägt der Zuckerhändler
(Herr erhalte ihm das Leben)
Warum frägt er nicht ums Wohlseyn
Seines Zucker Papageyes?

[1] Stuttg.—Tübingen 1812.

[2] Der Diwan von Mohammed Schemsed-din Hafis. Aus dem Persischen zum erstenmal ganz übersetzt von Joseph v. Hammer, Vorrede, p. 41. It is to be noted that v. Hammer here refers to the changing character of the terms of mysticism when used by Ḥāfiẓ, an idea which was later adopted by Goethe both in his Noten und Abhandlungen and in his own poetry in West-östlicher Divan.

[3] v. Hammer's translation, Vorrede, p. 39.

Wenn du bey dem Liebchen sitzest
Wein an seiner Seite trinkest,
O, erinnre dich der Freunde,
Die umher gleich Winden irren.

Wisse Rose dir geziemt es
Nicht so stolz zu seyn, auf Schönheit
Dass aus Stolz du nach der irren
Nachtigall nicht einmal fragest.

Nur mit guter Art und Weise
Wirst du den Geliebten fangen,
Denn es gehen kluge Vögel
Nicht ins Netz und in die Schlinge.

Wer belehrt mich, warum diese
Dunkeln Augen, hohe Formen
Diese vollen Mondsgesichter
Mir so gar nicht hold seyn wollen!

Deiner Schönheit fänd' ich wahrlich
Gar nichts anders auszusetzen,
Als dass insgemein die Schönen
Nichts von Treu' und Liebe wissen.

Für den Umgang mit den Freunden,
Für die Gunst des Glückes dankbar,
Sey auch eingedenk der Fremden,
Die durch Heid' und Wüsten streifen.

Was ists Wunder wenn im Himmel,
Durch Hafisens Lied gewecket,
Zu dem Lautenspiele Suhre's
Der Messias Reigen tanzet?[1]

Hammer's translations may seem crudely simple compared with later skilful German translations. They are rough diamonds, and have

[1] Hammer, Der Diwan von Mohammed Schemsed-din Hafis, Th. 1, pp. 16—17.

thus been forgotten. In the age of free form in poetry their roughness is no fault, it is, rather, as if these original, simple rhythms might give us a clearer sight of Ḥāfiẓ' world than many later interpretations. Hammer's translations never exaggerate, and in this they excel such esteemed translations as Bell's with their light passions. In the foreword, he explains that he has tried to preserve the original rhythms.[1] Yet the image of Persian measures given by these translations is rather faint since the rhyme is missing. More often they sound like mutations of contemporary German metres. I refer to Hammer's translation just quoted.

Hammer's translations can make it easier to understand the imagery of the original and clarify it, which makes them good comments on the poems. Let us look at the following part from the famous first ghazal:

Wegen des Moschusgeruchs,
Welchen der Ostwind geraubt
Deinen gekraus'ten Locken,
Wie vieles Blut entfloss dem Herzen!

Rosenzweig-Schwannau[2] has, more accurately,

Hoffnung, dass der Ostwind endlich löse,
Was an Duft in jenen Locken ruht,
Machte, dass ob ihren krausen Ringen
Jedes Herz beträufelt ward mit Blut.

Sometimes, however, clarification results in too simple a solution of stylistic problems.

Hammer's Diwan did not remain the only complete German translation [2] but as well as its interpretative value, it has significance as the inspiration of Goethe's *West-östlicher Divan*. Goethe's ecstasy at Hammer's translations, and the enthusiasm with which he studied Ḥāfiẓ, are quite remarkable.[3]

[1] v. Hammer's translation, Vorrede, p. 6.

[2] Der Diwan des grossen lyrischen Dichters Hafis im persischen Original herausgegeben ins Deutsche metrisch übersetzt und mit Anmerkungen versehen von Vincenz Ritter v. Rosenzweig-Schwannau, Bd. 1—3, Wien 1858—1864.

[3] West-östlicher Divan, hrsg. Hans-J. Weitz, Wiesbaden 1951, pp. 368—369. Aus den Tag- und Jahresheften 1815.

Despite all their merits, these translations lack the impulsive verbal and descriptive magic native to Ḥāfiẓ' lyrics. The experienced reader can make numerous good guesses as to what the original might have been, but this is a tedious task.

In studying Ḥāfiẓ' influence on the literary history of Europe there is good reason to linger over Goethe's *West-östlicher Divan* and the notes attached to it. This book is the only tributary of Ḥāfiẓ studies in Europe that is truly worthy of its source. Classical antiquity has left its mark on the literature of Europe, while Eastern literature, relatively close in time and place, has comparatively little influence. We need only think of the many times an author has donned the antique mask to convey questions of the moment, and the many times the ancient world has been made a question of the moment through the personality of a great author. Chénier, Hölderlin and Goethe's *Iphigenie* had no counterpart of Eastern literary origin before *West-östlicher Divan*. The question of whether this minimal amount of Oriental influence is due to the character or the quality of the source will be discussed in connection with Goethe's studies and explanations on the *Divan*.

Before discussing the relation of *West-östlicher Divan* to Ḥāfiẓ' work, let us review the opinions of researchers and critics on this collection. The immediate results of this masterpiece of Goethe's riper years were a number of very inferior poems by Rückert and Platen.[1]

To one who knows only the lyric poetry of the younger Goethe, the poetry inspired by the Sesenheim trip, some *Mailied* or the poem *Gefunden*, *West-östlicher Divan* is a closed book, with its strange use of language and the daring leaps from theme to theme which characterize the later style. For this reason the poetry of the *Divan* has been called the private orientalising lyrics of an enamoured old man. Konrad Burdach, who devoted his life to a study of the *Divan*, raised it from this position to the foremost of Goethe's works. His series of studies on the *Divan* starts in 1888 with the editing of the corresponding part of the Weimar edition, and continues with *Goethes West-östlicher Divan in biographischer und zeitgeschichtlicher Beleuchtung*,

[1] Friedrich Rückert, Östliche Rosen, 1822. August Graf von Platen-Hallermünde, Ghaselen, 1821.

1896, and the Jubiläumausgaben explanations of 1905 *Die Kunst und der dichterisch-religiöse Gehalt des West-östlichen Divans.* In 1926 he collected all his Divan studies in Vorspiel, Bd 2. His knowledge of the subject cannot be disputed; he spent years working through the ocean of Goethe's manuscripts, letters and diaries, and was the first to restore the original chronological order of the Divan poems.[1] Burdarch's materials for his enthusiastically written explications of Goethe's *Weltansicht* are gathered not only from the *Divan* but from the bulk of Goethe's works. When looking at the footnotes we notice that he has spent much time in studying works of contemporary orientalists. He has even a couple of times opposed an orientalist about the questions of mysticism in Ḥāfiẓ' poetry (pp. 367—373, p. 401).

Burdach has given the Divan poetry its correct place among Goethe's works.[2] »Burdach zeigt den Orient als 'dritte bildende Macht in der künstlerischen Entwicklung Goethes' (neben den beiden anderen: Antike und Naturergründung) . . . 'Der Divan ist das grosse Denkmal in Goethes orientalischer Provinz, wie »Prometheus», »Iphigenie», »Helena», die Marksteine seiner in drei Staffeln emporsteigenden antiken Eroberungen, wie der »Faust» das ragende Siegeszeichen seiner naturwissenschaftlichen Lebensarbeit.'»

Baumgart's comments[3] mainly aim at filling in the biographical background of the *Divan.* In interpreting the poems, he sticks to Burdarch's historical and philosophical methods. These have their weaknesses and their merits. For a correct understanding of the Divan poems, biographical information is often necessary. But Baumgart's long biographical comment on the poem *Vollmondnacht* has no bearing on that which affects the reader as the art of poetry. We mainly want to read *Vollmondnacht* as an impressive poem, not in the historical context of a moonlight promenade. Korff, more absorbed in the poem itself, interprets the effect of *Vollmondnacht* more clearly in a few sentences, ». . . und hat vielleicht von allen Liebesgedichten des Divans in seiner sinnlichen Glut das stärkste innere orientalische Kolorit». Baumgart's penchant for philosophical explanations is clear in the comment on the poem *Wiederfinden,* where the poem is dealt with as though it were some obscure fragment of ancient philosophy whose

[1] H. Baumgart, Goethes lyrische Dichtung, 3. Bd., Heidelberg 1939, p. 6.
[2] H. Kindermann, Das Goethebild des XX. Jahrhunderts, pp. 332—333.
[3] Goethes lyrische Dichtung, Heidelberg 1939.

meaning must be made plain to the reader. To the reader the philosophical meaning, however lucidly it may have been explained, is coloured by the pulse and melody of this kind of lyric. The power of the lyrical sonority has scarcely allowed Goethe to finish off his philosophy neatly.[1]

On the relation between Goethe and Ḥāfiẓ, Baumgart gives the opinions of other scholars in the foreword of the third part of his work. Schaeder's very profound observations, founded on the *Divan* and a good knowledge of Ḥāfiẓ, receive considerable space. Baumgart lingers over the vital question of whether Ḥāfiẓ' love and wine are to be interpreted mystically or literally, the essential point in the relations between Goethe's and Ḥāfiẓ' divans. In his Divan poems Goethe comes close to Ḥāfiẓ on this question, an indication of their spiritual brotherhood. Here we see, if darkly, his comprehension of Ḥāfiẓ' poetry, in his *Buch Hafis*, and especially the chapter *Hafis*, in *Noten und Abhandlungen*. In a wider sense it is revealed by all other features of the Divan poetry; and by many parts of the *Noten und Abhandlungen*.

The question of interpretation, allegorical or literal, in comparing Ḥāfiẓ and Goethe has been studied by H. Schaeder. Schaeder's *Goethes Erlebnis des Ostens* was published in 1938. It contains a long essay on Ḥāfiẓ which is one of the few studies in Persian literature by a person with taste well-schooled by European literature. Schaeder deals with Ḥāfiẓ on the basis of the image provided by Goethe's *Divan* and *Noten und Abhandlungen*. Schaeder's answer to the question of whether Ḥāfiẓ is to be interpreted allegorically or literally is: neither. Ḥāfiẓ' special position in Persian literature rests on his ambiguity, somewhere between the two classic views, the mystic and the worldly. To quote Schaeder,[2] »Es kommt nun alles darauf an zu erkennen, dass in diesem scheinbar spielerisch geistreichen Hereinziehen religiöser, insbesondere mystischer Motive eine Stilabsicht des Dichters, ja vielleicht die ihn eigentlich beherrschende Stilidee zu finden ist. Sie wird verdunkelt und zerstört, wenn das Gleichgewicht, das sie zwischen den beiden Bereichen des Sinnlichen und des Übersinnlichen herstellt, zugunsten eines der beiden Elemente aufgehoben wird.«

---

[1] H. Baumgart, Goethes lyrische Dichtung, p. 71.

[2] H. Schaeder, Goethes Erlebnis des Ostens, pp. 120—121.

A representative of the newer Ḥāfiẓ research, R. Lescot, gives a similar if perhaps clearer explanation.[1] Lescot's conception seems to correspond to Goethe's opinion of Ḥāfiẓ.

To return to the history of the study of *West-östlicher Divan*, the 1930s and 1940s led to a breach in studies of this collection as in study of Goethe's work as a whole. To quote H. Kindermann on the deep gulf separating the 1932 and 1949 meetings of the Goethe-Verein, »Zwiespalt und Dissonanz sind seine Leitmotive . . . Die Existentialisten aller Schattierungen, die deutschen, wie Jaspers und Heidegger, aber auch Ernst Jünger, die französisch-materialistischen wie Sartre und die französisch-katholischen wie Marcel, sind allesamt dadurch geeint, dass sie entschlossen sind, dem 'Nichts' offen zu begegnen. Sie wollen der 'Bewegung zum Nullpunkt' (Ernst Jünger) in die Speichen fallen.«[2]

Goethe is no longer only the poet-king who has refined German life to the point of an ideal harmony. Recent decades have swung to the opposite pole of Goethian harmony, calling for a re-evaluation of Werther's neurasthenia, Tasso's psychological disturbances, and the sense of solar eclipse in the Marienbad elegy. The demonic, destructive side of Goethe's work has been revealed, and our days have made a vital contribution to Goethe studies.[3]

The main object of this survey is an analysis of the *Noten und Abhandlungen*. These essays are, as Burdach says, Goethe's longest exercise in poetics. Their stylistic form is sometimes irritating, sometimes astounding. In this work on poetics and short history of Persian literature Goethe sometimes discusses quite irrelevant matters, and sometimes, with an equally disingenuous style, he ponders the most important questions.

Goethe's *Noten und Abhandlungen zu besserem Verständnis des West-östlichen Divans* may with justice be called the masterpiece of early European oriental work. It consists of about 150 octavo pages,

---

[1] Bulletin d'études orientales, Tome 10, p. 95.
»Dans le vocabulaire de Ḥāfiz, le mot 'amour' est susceptible des interprétations les plus variées. C'est un terme qui recouvre, à lui seul, tout la gamme les affections; il désigne un sentiment qui va de l'émotion charnelle à l'amitié la plus pure . . .«

[2] H. Kindermann, Das Goethebild des 20. Jahrhunderts, pp. 512—513.

[3] H. Kindermann, Das Goethebild des 20. Jahrhunderts, pp. 512—704.

70 of which deal exclusively with Persian literature, while the rest of the book is also closely linked with the problems of Persian literature. In Goethe's day, study of literature meant the production of a book with the characteristics of an oriental *taḏkire*, a chronicle in which the main biographical data related to the subject were given. These are, indeed, important factors in forming an opinion of an author, but the explanatory, exegetic side must not be forgotten. Unlike his contemporaries, Goethe shows, in *Noten und Abhandlungen*, an understanding of the concept of Oriental literature that is close in many ways to the modern outlook. He tries to give biographical data, and bases them on the best sources available to him, but even at this early stage of Oriental studies he has also given his own reflections, moving in the zone between philosophy and aesthetics, on the character of the literature of the Middle East. Thus he has come to a field where the study of Persian literature has seldom strayed.

Hammer-Purgstall, with his great abilities, collected all the stories about writers he could. He mastered many languages and wrote the literary histories — the *taḏkire* — of Persia and the Arab countries. The only one to attempt a more extensive discussion of Ḥāfiẓ' poetry in the nineteenth century was Rasmussen, with his *Studier over Ḥāfiẓ med Sideblik til andre persiske Lyrikere.*[1] Goethe's standard in the study of Ḥāfiẓ was not even approached until the 1930s, with the publication of Schaeder's *Goethes Erlebnis des Ostens*. A study of Ḥāfiẓ in the Goethian sense demands the taking of speculative measures, made necessary by the absence of reliable facts. Taḏkire-writers are no help; their information is unreliable, being hearsay and legendary in nature. We are left with the study of style and with aesthetic theory. Studies of style in Persian literature include the works of Rasmussen and E. G. Browne, and in the field of aesthetic speculations we might name H. H. Schaeder, H. R. Roemer, W. Lentz, R. Lescot and A. J. Arberry. Thus Goethe's Oriental studies, *Noten und Abhandlungen*, are pioneer work. Goethe speaks with the assurance of true knowledge, and it must be remembered that he had spent long years in study of the literature of the Middle East.[2]

[1] Copenhagen 1892.

[2] We are here reminded of a passage in René Wellek's Concepts of criticism, in the chapter The crisis of Comparative literature: »Far too much has been made of the 'authority' of the specialist who often may have only the biblio-

It was in June 1814 that he became acquainted with Joseph v. Hammer's translation, *Der Diwan von Mohammed Schemsed-din Hafis*, and he studied the work for four years. This new acquaintanceship, separated by centuries, was something of a revelation.[1]

In his early youth Goethe had studied Hebrew literature, and his close contact with Oriental cultures lasted throughout his life.[2] His opinions, then, cannot be considered those of a totally incompetent amateur. He does sometimes present his thought so obscurely that it is laid open to any interpretation whatsoever. The object of this study is, however, an attempt to study these meditations. Goethe's views on Ḥāfiẓ are of two kinds: those put forward in *Noten und Abhandlungen*, and those expressed indirectly in *West-östlicher Divan*. We shall here concentrate on *Noten und Abhandlungen*. First, however, we must look at Goethe's Oriental sources.

The tendency among Goethe scholars to see purposeful predestination in his every act, and to read into every event a part of a great scheme leading to the consummation of a character, is well known. In the same way there is a temptation to read into the early Oriental studies of the boy Goethe, and his great interest in the Old Testament

---

graphical knowledge or the external information without necessarily having the taste, the sensibility, and the range of the non-specialist whose wider perspective and keener insight may well make up for years of intense application. There is nothing presumptuous or arrogant in advocating a greater mobility and ideal universality in our studies. The whole conception of fenced-off reservations with signs of 'no trespassing' must be distasteful to a free mind.» (P. 291).

[1] »... die sämmtlichen Gedichte Hafis' in der von Hammerschen Übersetzung ... wenn ich früher den hier und da in Zeitschriften übersetzt mitgeteilten einzelnen Stücken dieses herrlichen Poeten nichts abgewinnen konnte, so wirkten sie doch jetzt zusammen desto lebhafter auf mich ein, und ich musste mich dagegen produktiv verhalten, weil ich sonst vor der mächtigen Erscheinung nicht hätte bestehen können. Die Einwirkung war zu lebhaft, die deutsche Übersetzung lag vor, und ich musste also hier Veranlassung finden zu eigener Teilnahme. Alles was dem Stoff und dem Sinne nach bei mir Ähnliches verwahrt und gehegt worden, tat sich hervor, und dies mit um so mehr Heftigkeit, als ich höchst nötig fühlte, mich aus der wirklichen Welt, die sich selbst offenbar und im Stillen bedrohte, in eine ideelle zu flüchten, an welcher vergnüglichen Teil zu nehmen meiner Lust, Fähigkeit und Willen überlassen war.» Tag- und Jahresheften 1815, W.—ö. Divan, pp. 368—369.

[2] Albert Bielschowsky, Goethe, 1913, part 1, p. 17.

which led to pursuit of historical truth in the Pentateuch and the essay *The Children of Israel in the Desert*, in 1797, part of a dynamic evolution which culminated in the publication of the *West-östlicher Divan* in 1819, when the poet was 70 years old. In my view we are justified in succumbing to this temptation. It may have been a matter of common occurrence in the eighteenth century for an eleven-year-old boy in financially comfortable circumstances to be taught Hebrew, but Goethe's studies in Yiddish at this tender age may well be regarded as exceptional. One explanation of this early interest in the Orient may lie in his great love of the Bible, its heroic stories, love poems, hymns and idylls, not to mention its ethical teaching. His first attempts at Biblical dramatization were made in the period 1762—3, when the thirteen-year-old Goethe wrote a play about Joseph. In the period 1772—4 Goethe eagerly studied the life of Mohammed, and met Lavater and Basedow. He made a journey with these two, of such different philosophies, and witnessed their quarrels. According to *Dichtung und Wahrheit* Book 14, the trip to Ems with Lavater and Basedow inspired him with the idea of presenting the life of the Prophet. He saw himself as the child of the world, »das Weltkind», who, standing between the two prophets was better able to judge them than either:

> Propheten rechts,
> Propheten links,
> das Weltkind in der Mitte.

Of this projected life of Mohammed we have *Mahomets Gesang*.[1] As already mentioned, in 1797 Goethe was particularly interested in the historical truth of the stories of the Israelites and their wanderings in the wilderness. He writes six letters to Schiller about his 'Kritisch-historisch-poetische Arbeit', and wonders just why Moses was considered a great leader of the Children of Israel, when he managed to spend forty years fooling around in the Sinai desert. He comes to the conclusion that Moses did not, as stated in the Pentateuch, do this. In the essay *Israel in der Wüste*, first published in *Noten und Abhandlungen*, but dating back to 1797, Goethe approaches the story of Moses with considerable shrewdness. He gives a detailed list of the

[1] In Göttinger Musen-Almanach 1774.

progress of the Children of Israel through the desert, compares the information given in the different books of the Pentateuch, and comes to the conclusion that Moses could not have spent 40 years in the desert. This essay is not a diverting story, but evidence that he had been occupied by the problems of the Pentateuch for some time.

In 1802 Goethe tells Schiller that he has read the *Arabian Nights*, and later in the same year he is busy reading St. Paul and *Gita Govinda* in Jones' English translation. He is very upset about the German translation of Jones' translation, because it leaves out all the bold sexual scenes, already cut by Jones. Goethe wants to make a new translation of Jones' version, to give German readers a truer picture of the poem.

Henry Crabb Robinson, an Englishman, records an interesting conversation at the end of April, 1804. »He . . . said to[A. W.] Schlegel: I am glad to hear that your brother means to translate the Sacontala. — I shall rejoice to see that poem as it is, and not as we have it from the Moral Englishman [Jones]. There was a sarcastic emphasis on the words 'des moralischen Engländers'. He then went on: Eigentlich aber hasse ich alles Orientalische. — By which probably he meant rather that he infinitely preferred the Greek to the Asiatic mind. He then went on: I am glad there is something that I do hate. — For otherwise one is in danger of falling into the dull habit of liberally finding all things good in their place, and that is destructive of all true feeling.«[1] The ambiguity of Goethe's relationship to the culture of the Orient is later seen in *Noten und Abhandlungen*.

During the Franco-Prussian War of 1806, Goethe escaped from patient endurance to the memoirs of Pietro della Valle. Della Valle spent twelve years in the East, most of them in Persia, and married a Persian woman.

For almost every year of Goethe's mature life there is a note having some bearing on the Orient in his *Tag- und Jahresheften*. I here choose those which show that turning to the Orient which has earlier (p. 57) been described as part of a great scheme in his life. We can believe in a dynamic evolution which culminated in the publication of the *West-östlicher Divan* when we read what Goethe wrote to Rochlitz on January 30th 1812: »Dass Sie meine asiatische Weltan-

[1] W.—ö. Divan, p. 360.

fänge so freundlich aufnehmen ist mir von grossem Wert. Es schlingt sich die daher für mich genommene Kultur durch mein ganzes Leben, und wird noch manchmal in unerwarteten Erscheinungen hervortreten».[1]

Goethe could not have known that his Oriental pursuits would appear yet again in unexpected form, as a volcanic force, only two years later.

Before taking up *Noten und Abhandlungen*, we try on the following pages (56—65) to collect and evaluate Goethe's Oriental sources.

Of all Goethe's Oriental sources, the most immediate was Josef von Hammer, later Hammer-Purgstall. Goethe mentions Hammer's translation of the *Divan* of Ḥāfiẓ and his *Fundgruben des Orients* as the most important source for the Divan poetry and *Noten und Abhandlungen*. The first comment on Hammer's Ḥāfiẓ is a brief note in Goethe's diary for June 7th 1814: *Hafis Divan*.

The following resumé of Hammer's life and works largely follows Johann Fück's description in his *Die arabischen Studien in Europa*, Leipzig 1955.

Fück notes that philological studies in France broke free earlier from the Sacra Philologia and theological discipline. In Germany, this did not happen until the early nineteenth century, with a few brillant exceptions like Reiske.

Josef von Hammer, the spearhead of this new movement in the German-speaking area, was born in 1774 in Graz, son of a Kaiserlich-Königlicher Gubernialrat. He attended the Oriental Academy in 1789—99, and was then sent to the Internuntiatur of the Viennese court in Constantinople as a 'Sprachknabe'. He had a knack for languages, and soon mastered the three main Islamic tongues. His Turkish was excellent, he spoke Arabic fairly well, and his Persian was so strong that he translated the Meditations of Marcus Aurelius into Persian, and in later negotiations with Persian emissaries in Vienna always used that language.

In 1800 he was sent on a special mission to Egypt, where he gained a close acquaintance with the Arabian Nights stories. From Egypt he went to England, returning to Istanbul as Legation secretary in 1802. In 1806 he was appointed Consul at Iaşi, in Rumania. In 1811

[1] Tag- und Jahresheften 1812, W.-ö. Divan, p. 363.

he became interpreter at the court of Vienna, and after that he could give himself almost wholly to his Oriental studies. Between 1809 and 1818 he edited *Fundgruben des Orients* with the help of a rich Viennese patron, Count Wenzeslaus von Rzewusky. This work is almost as relevant to our subject as his translation of the entire *Divan* of Ḥāfiẓ, and deserves a closer look.

Its aim was to break the dominion of the Philologia Sacra and emphasize the importance of the three great Islamic languages, Arabic, Persian and Turkish, as opposed to Hebrew and Chaldaic, as he put it in the preface to the second volume. The role of Persian literature is strongly emphasized throughout the work. The Persian work given in the *Fundgruben* is the Vincenz von Rosenzweig-Schwannau (1791—1865) partial text and translation in blank verse of Ǧāmī's Yūsuf o Zuleiḫā (II 47 f. 313—315; III 290—309; IV 171—178; V 325—330).

Rosenzweig-Schwannau later published a more detailed German translation of the whole *Divan* of Ḥāfiẓ, fuller than that of Hammer. Valentin Hussard (1787—1865) gave the text and a blank verse translation of part of the *Maṯnavī* of Rūmī (II 161—164; III 335—347; IV 87—92; V 99—101). J. G. L. Kosegarten, Goethe's friend and protégé, published the text and a blank verse translation of the heroic epic *Burzōnāma* (V 309—330).

The great French master Silvestre de Sacy, to whom Goethe wrote the dedicatory poem (which was translated into Arabic by J. G. L. Kosegarten), the last in his *West-östlicher Divan*, contributed a text and prose translation of 'Aṭṭār's Pendnāme (II 1—24, 211—233, 455—469).

Hammer-Purgstall opposed the idea that only the old classics are important. He wanted to give a vivid picture of the whole Middle East, with the help of classics and the latest literature, as well as letters of eye-witnesses. A fascinating part of the *Fundgruben des Orients* is formed by the letters of Ulrich Jasper Seetzen (1767—1811), whom Hammer had met in Constantinople. Seetzen lived in Cairo between 1807 and 1809, and made a pilgrimage, dressed as a Moslem, to Mecca. He died in Yemen in 1811. Many other correspondents kept an eye on the British book market, especially the publications of the College of Fort William in Calcutta (I 195; III 277 ff.; IV 178—181).

Hammer's own contributions account for over a sixth of the bulk of *Fundgruben*. He gave examples of the work of Šāhanšāhnāma of Ṣabā, the poet of the ruling court of Persia, and published and translated some poems of the contemporary Oriental scholar Abū Ṭālib Ḫān, whom Hammer met on the latter's trip to Europe. Abū Ṭālib Ḫān was the publisher of the Calcutta edition of the *Divan* of Ḥāfiẓ. In his endless curiosity about anything in his field, Hammer published details of a 13th-century Persian book on jewellery, describing their appearance and the places where the jewels were to be found. It is possible that the references to jewels in Goethe's *Divan* come from this source.

A third of the contributors were Viennese orientalists. The second largest group were the French orientalists, while the others were Russian, English and Italian. Hammer was aware of the European scope of his publication; the languages used in the *Fundgruben* are German, French, English, Latin, Italian, Spanish and Modern Greek.

Hammer-Purgstall produced over a hundred works in all. Very few of them still live, though more, I think, than modern orientalists usually admit.

»Heute sind seine Übersetzungen aus dem Arabischen ebenso versunken wie seine siebenbändige Geschichte der arabischen Literatur und seine Beiträge zur persischen Philologie . . .» (P. 165). J. Fück states that the only part of Hammer's work still valid is in the domain of Osman history and political science. Yet it is to be doubted if the Rosenzweig-Schwannau translation of all Ḥāfiẓ' works excels those by Hammer. Personally I doubt it very much.

Hammer's great merit, which cannot be disputed, is that of having inspired such men as Goethe and Friedrich Rückert with the flame of Persian literature.

One of Goethe's early Oriental contacts was Johann Gottfried Eichhorn. His long study on the children of Israel in the desert, written in 1797, was based on Eichhorn's commentaries and, as we can see from a passage in *Noten*, Goethe held Eichhorn in great esteem.[1]

[1] »Mit vergnüglicher Anerkennung bemerke ich, bei meinen gegenwärtigen Arbeiten noch dasselbe Exemplar benutze, welches mir der hochverdiente Mann, von seiner Ausgabe des Jonesschen Werks, vor zweiundvierzig Jahren verehrte, als wir ihn noch unter die Unseren zählten und aus seinem Mund gar manches Heilsam-Belehrende vernahmen.» W—ö. Divan, p. 240.

The Orientalists with whom Goethe was personally well acquainted were Lorsbach, Kosegarten and v. Diez; his acquaintanceship with them was either through personal contact or through correspondence.

Georg Wilhelm Lorsbach (1715—1816) gave, to judge by Goethe's own notes,[1] some information to Goethe. He was a predecessor of Kosegarten in the Jena oriental studies.

Johann Gottfried Ludwig Kosegarten (Altenkirchen 1792 — Greifswald 1860), was the son of the poet Ludwig Gotthard Kosegarten (1758—1818). He was a pupil of Silvestre de Sacy in Paris in 1812—1814, and succeeded Lorsbach at Jena in 1817—24. After 1824 he was a professor in Greifswald, and dedicated himself largely to the study of Low German. It was Goethe who recommended Kosegarten's appointment to the chair in Oriental languages at Jena, and Goethe sought his advice frequently when writing *Noten und Abhandlungen*. The lines of Arabic in the dedication of the *West-östlicher Divan*[2] to Silvestre de Sacy were by Kosegarten, who gave de Sacy, his teacher, the copy with the Arabic lines and Goethe's complimentary letter. Goethe was of great help to Kosegarten, frequently supplying him with Oriental texts that were hard to get. He also had other links with Kosegarten, standing godfather to one of his children and writing an epitaph for the tomb of the elder Kosegarten.

Heinrich Friedrich Freiherr von Diez (Anhalt 1751—Berlin 1817) was chargé d'affaires in Constantinople. In 1786 he was ennobled and appointed ambassador to Constantinople. After 1807 he lived the life of a landed proprietor in Berlin, dedicated to his Oriental studies. His great legacy of rare books and manuscripts is the central part of the Oriental section of the Berlin Staatsbibliothek.

Diez was an early contributor to the *Fundgruben des Orients*, After a 600-page satire, *Unfug und Betrug in der morgenländischen Literatur*, directed against Hammer, there came a rift between the orientalists of Vienna and Berlin. The situation developed so far that E. G. Hammer lost his seat in the Berliner Akademie der Wissenschaften. In this famous quarrel Goethe remained neutral.[3]

---

[1] W.—ö. Divan, pp. 240—241.

[2] P. 263.

[3] Lately a monograph on the relations of Goethe and Diez has been published: K. Mommsen, Goethe und Diez, Berlin 1961.

An evaluation of the work of the four orientalists in personal contact with Goethe and who thus were important sources for him leads to the conclusion that none of them was really a great genius in this field. In his *Die Arabischen Studien in Europa*, Johann Fück does not dedicate a chapter to any of them, as he does to Jones, v. Hammer and Silvestre de Sacy. Further, three of the four were unattached to any great centre of Oriental studies. Kosegarten was, indeed, a pupil of de Sacy, but at the time of his advice to Goethe he was still very young, not much over twenty. In the period 1814—1819 the great centres of Oriental studies were Vienna, Paris and Fort William College in Calcutta. We have already seen that Goethe was not unfamiliar with the work of these centres. His *West-östlicher Divan* is dedicated to de Sacy, with Kosegarten's lines in Arabic, and at the end of the *Divan*, as he expressly states in the notes on the chapter dedicated to v. Hammer, v. Hammer was his main source of inspiration. The English scholars were known to him through v. Hammer's *Fundgruben*, where their work was regularly reviewed, and his *Tages- und Jahresbücher* have many references in the reading lists to English scholars: 4—20. Dez. 1814: Lektüre: Jones *Poesis Asiatica*, *Fundgruben des Orients*, Hyde, Ferdusi, Scott-Waring. From the 1815 diary: Lektüre: Koran, Olearius, Saadi, Gulistan, Herbelot. Werke über Mahomet von Rehbinder, Turpin, Boulainvillers, Oriental Collections, Bei Serenissima Ferdusi. Die Moallakats. 1818: Lektüre: *Laou-Sengh-Urh;* Motanabbi; Kalidasa, *Meghaduta;* Werke von Brissonius, Ouseley, Malcolm, Reland, Daniell, Elphinstone, M. v. Kotzebue, Raffles. Goethe even translated H. H. Wilson's English translations into German. A closer look at Goethe's wide readings in Oriental literature shows his omission of much material that could have contributed materially to his Oriental knowledge. I have prepared a list of works possibly, and apparently, not read by Goethe. Here I have taken a collection of Oriental material not found among the books borrowed by Goethe from the Weimar Library, which are listed in the Insel edition of the *West-östlicher Divan*. The list includes works not found in Goethe's own library. For this I have used Hans Ruppert's Goethes Bibliothek (Weimar 1958). The list also includes works not mentioned in Goethe's own letters and diaries or in other people's letters to him: such authors, in fact, as are not to be found in the index of the Insel edi-

tion. Some of the authors appear in the index of the Hamburg edition[1] of Goethe's works, but the works seem to have been unknown to Goethe.

The list tries to show the possible lacunae in Goethe's knowledge of the East.

A glance at the list in Colonel Wilberforce-Clarke's translation of the whole *Divan* of Ḥāfiẓ shows a rather strange gap. The list, at the beginning of the book, shows all works on or translations of Ḥāfiẓ previous to Wilberforce-Clarke's own translation. Prior to 1819, the publication date of the *West-östlicher Divan*, there are twelve works on Ḥāfiẓ, of which Goethe knew only two. Is it likely that a reading of the other ten would have changed his views on Ḥāfiẓ? Hardly. Goethe was very familar with Hammer's translation of the complete *Divan* of Ḥāfiẓ,, and reading earlier partial translations in Latin, English or French could not have given him more insight into Ḥāfiẓ' poetry; Goethe's insight was gained largely by competing with Ḥāfiẓ, writing poetry of the same genre. In *Noten und Abhandlungen* (the *Übersetzungen* chapter) Goethe says that a straightforward prose translation is preferable to a paraphrase in European styles and metres. Here he is referring to the earlier translation which attempted a stylistic imitation of the French classics.

Another surprising gap is the absence of Carsten Niebuhr's *Reisebeschreibung nach Arabien und anderen umliegenden Ländern*, a famous work described by Wilhelm Barthold as the best scholarly description of the countries concerned that had appeared up to that date.

Again, my list includes the name of Grotefend, who in 1802 published the work that proved the start of cuneiform studies, a decipherment of some of the ancient Persian royal names at Persepolis. This work is of prime importance, but it may be remembered that it was for some decades forgotten, until Rawlinson's more thorough work on cuneiform texts came out.[2] Goethe here shares the general ignorance of his time.

J. J. Reiske is mentioned once by Goethe, in a brief, pejorative

---

[1] Hamburger Ausgabe, Wegner, Bd. 1—14, 1960—1964.

[2] H. Rawlinson, The Persian cuneiform inscription at Behistun decyphered and translated; . . . JRAS X, 1847.

reference in *Noten und Abhandlungen*. Here too, Goethe is not free from the prevailing ignorance around him. Goethe speaks with much more reverence of poorer Arabists such as Kosegarten and Eichhorn. It was only later that Reiske was fully appreciated and granted his due as the most important Arabist of his day.

If we look up the entry 'Persia' in the British Museum catalogue, we find a list, several pages long, of anonymous itineraries and other works on Persia, all of which seem to have been unknown to Goethe.

Some of the entries in my list are bibliographically incomplete, but as these works appear of minor importance in the search for gaps in Goethe's Oriental knowledge, I have left them as I found them in literary sources.

Abulfedae Annales Moslemici. Latinos. . . fecit J. J. Reiske. 1754.

Bernier, François. Histoire de la dernière révolution des États du Grand Mogol. 4 tom. Paris 1670. Translated into German in 1753 by J. J. Schwabe.

Bibliotheca Arabico-Hispana Escurialensis. I—II. 1760—1770.
Ed. Michael Casiri (al-Ġazīrī).
»Für die Arabistik am bedeutendsten war jedoch die monumentale Bibliotheca Arabico-Hispana-Escurialensis in welcher der Maronit M. C. (al-Ġazīrī 1720—1791) die wertvolle arabische Handschriftensammlung des Escurial beschrieb.» (Fück, p. 125.)

Bhagavadgita. Transl. by Charles Wilkins. 1785.
Goethe read this, but later, in 1824. See G:s library.

de Chinon, Fr. Gabriel. Relations nouvelles du Levant. Lyon 1671.

Foster, G. A. A Journey from Bengal to England. London 1798.
Goethe knew Foster as a transl. of Sakuntala. See G:s library.

L'Abbé Foucher. » . . . a prolific scholar who published in the Mémoires de l'Académie a great number of papers, the first five of which appeared before Anquetil sent news from India of his discovery of the Avesta.» (Duchesne-Guillemin, J. The Western Response to Zoroaster, p. 13.)

Gladwin, Francis. Dissertations on the Rhetoric, Prosody and Rhyme of the Persians. Calcutta—London 1801.

Gladwin, Francis. The Persian Moonshee I—II. Calcutta 1799—1801.

Grotefend, Georg Friedrich. Praevia de cuneatis quas vocant inscriptionibus Persepolitanis legendis et explicandis relatio. Göttingen 1802.
Grotefend was a grammar school teacher in Göttingen and Frankfurt, after 1812 Headmaster of a famous school in Hannover. This treatise made him famous. This work was published by Göttinger Gesellschaft der Wissenschaft in 1802. Grotefend studied old Persian royal names and thereby for the first time solved the problem of cuneiform writing.

du Halde, Jean Baptiste. Description géographique, historique, chronologique,

politique, et physique de l'empire de la Chine et de la Tartarie Chinoise. 4 tom. Paris 1735.

du Halde, Jean Baptiste. Briefe aus Persien und der Türckey. . . Von denen Kriegs Empörungen in Persien unter Tamas Koulikan bis auf dessen Feld-Zug in Indien. (Allerhand Reis-Beschreibungen. Bd. 4. 1728.)

Hindley, John Haddon. Persian lyrics, or scattered poems from the Divan-i-Hafiz with paraphrases. (Persian and Engl., 11 odes.) London 1800.

Hitopadesa. Translation by Charles Wilkins in 1787.

Hyde, T. Syntagma dissertationum. Oxford 1767.

The first ode of Ḥāfiẓ rendered into Latin prose.

Jones, William. Asiatic researches. Vol. 3 (p. 172) The mystical poetry of the Persians. Calcutta—London 1792.

Kämpfer, Engelbert. Amoenitates Exoticae. 1712.

»Das Werk gehört zu den wichtigsten Quellen über den Staat der Safawiden.» (B. Spuler, A Locust's Leg. 1962. P. 235.)

Kosegarten, Johann Gottfried Ludwig. Carminum orientalium Triga. Stralsundii 1815.

Goethe knew Kosegarten well and arranged for his appointment at the age of 25 as professor of Oriental studies at Jena, which chair he held from 1817 to 1824.

Lord, Henry. A Display of Two Forraigne Sects: The Sect of the Banians, the Ancient Natives of India; and the Sect of the Persees, the Ancient Inhabitants of Persia. 1630.

du Mans, Raphaël. L'Estat de la Perse. 1660.

Mesgnien Meninski, Franciscus. Linguarum Orientalium Turcicae, Arabicae, Persicae institutiones. Wien 1680.

One ghazal translated.

Mirkhond. Les Estats et empires. Transl. by Briot. 1672.

Morier, J. A Journey through Persia, Armenia and Asia Minor to Constantinople in the years 1808 and 1809. London 1812.

Niebuhr, Carsten. Beschreibung von Arabien. Kopenhagen 1772.

Niebuhr, Carsten. Reisebeschreibung nach Arabien und anderen umliegenden Ländern I—III. Kopenhagen 1774, 1778.

Carsten Niebuhr was a member of the 1761—67 expedition to Syria, Egypt, Arabia, India, Persia, Palestina, Asia Minor and Constantinople, financed by the Danish government. One of its aims was to obtain materials for the study of the Bible. Niebuhr's account of his travels is regarded by many as the best that had appeared hitherto.

Nott, John, Kitāb-e lālezār az Dīvān-e Ḥāfiẓ. (17 odes from Hafiz, rendered into English verse.) London 1787.

Nova Acta Eruditorum. Ed. by Menken. Cum suppl. et ind. ad ann. 1682—1776 Leipzig.

A journal where the scholars — including orientalists — of Goethe's time published the results of their research.

Ouseley, W. Persian Miscellanies. London 1795.

Includes 5 odes by Hafiz in translation.

Goethe borrowed another work by Ouseley, the Oriental Collections, from the Weimarer Bibliothek.

Persival, R. Beschreibung der Insel Ceylon. Übers. von J. A. Berger. Lipsiae 1779.

Pococke, Ed. Specimen historiae Arabum. 1649. Includes extracts from Šahrastānī's History of the Sects.

Prideaux, Humphrey. The Old and New Testament connected in the History of the Jews. 1715—18.

Reiske, Johann Jacob. Coniecturae in Jobum et Proverbia Salomonis cum eiusdem Oratione de studio arabicae linguae. Lipsiae 1779.

Reiske, Johann Jacob. Prodidagmata ad Hagji Chalifae librum memorialem rerum a Muhammedanis gestarum exhibentia introductionem generalem in historiam sic dictam Orientalem. This work was published by Reiske's pupil J. B. Koehler with Abulfedae Tabulae Syriae in 1766. 2nd ed. 1786.

Reiske, Johann Jacob. Sammlung einiger arabischer Sprüchwörter, die von den Stecken und Stäben hergenommen sind. Leipzig 1758.

Reiske, Johann Jacob. Doktor Johann Jacob Reiskens von ihm selbst aufgesetzte Lebensbeschreibung. Leipzig 1783.

Reiske, Johann Jacob. Briefe über das arabische Münzwesen. 1757. Ed. later by Eichhorn 1781.

Reiske, Johann Jacob. De principibus Muhammedanis literarum laude claris.

Reiske obtained by this work the title of professor and a pension. This pension was not paid regularly and did not help his position. R. was regarded by the professors of Theology as a freethinker because he did not condemn Mohammed as a false prophet. He wanted to introduce the history of the Islamic peoples in general history. (Fück, p. 117.) He gained many enemies by this book.

Reiske, Johann Jacob. 26 Makamen, Arabisch und Lateinisch. 1737.

Reiske, Johann Jacob. Tharaphae Moallakah cum Scholiis Nahas. e mss. Leidensibus Arabicae edidit, vertit, illustravit . . . Lugd. Bat. 1742.

Johann Jacob Reiske (1716—1774) was the first renowned Arabist in Germany (Fück, p. 108). As a 20 year old youth he had worked through all the printed Arabic works that existed at that time. Reiske quarrelled with A. Schultens in 1749 and as a result did not receive any chair in spite of his brilliant publications. »R. hat die arabische Philologie auf die Höhe einer selbstständigen Wissenschaft erhoben. Keiner hat so klar wie er ihre Eigengesetzlichkeit und Unabhängigkeit erkannt, keiner sich so bewusst gegen die damals herrschende Sacra Philologia gewandt. . .» (Fück, p. 122.)

Rewitzky, Karl Emerich. Specimen poeseos Persicae. Wien 1771. 16 ghazals of Hafiz in Persian and Latin translations with added commentaries to these poems by Sudi (Fück, p. 131). Rewitzky, who was a diplomat representing the Court of Vienna, met W. Jones in 1768.

Richardson, J. Specimen of Persian Poetry . . . London 1774. 16 odes with

an English translation and paraphrase, chiefly from the Specimen poeseos Persicae of K. E. Rewitzky.

Rousseau, S. Richardson's Specimen of Persian Poetry, rev. and corrected. London 1802.

de Sacy, Silvestre. Mémoires sur diverses antiquités de la Perse. 1793.

de Sacy, Silvestre. Chrestomathie arabe. 1806.

Schnurrer, Chr. Fr. Bibliotheca Arabica. Halae 1811.
A disciple of Reiske.

Schultens, Albert. Thomae Erpenii Grammatica Arabica... accedunt excerpta ... ed. conversa et notis illustrata ... Lugd. Bat. 1748.

Schultens, Albert. Proverbia Salomonis. Versionem ad Hebraeum fontem expressit atque commentarium adiecit. Lugd. Bat. 1748.

Wilken, F. Institutiones ad fundamenta linguae persicae ... Lipsiae 1805.

Zend-Avesta. Text and transl. by Abraham Hyacinthe Anquetil Duperron 1771. Translated into German by J. F. Kleuker 1776—77. Goethe read another work by Anquetil Duperron which was translated into German under the name: Reisen nach Ostindien nebst einer Beschreibung der bürgerlichen und Religionsgebräuche der Parsen als eine Einleitung zum Zend-Avesta, dem Gesetzbuch der Parsen durch Zoroaster. Transl. by J. J. Purmann. Frankfurt a. M. 1776.

»*Ältere Perser*»

This study intends to deal only with those parts of Goethe's notes on Oriental literature which have some connection with Persian literature.

The first of these is the chapter »*Ältere Perser*». Here Goethe treats his subject like the ideal amateur. He neglects to name his sources, yet they lead him to daring deductions.[1]

In this chapter Goethe transforms Zoroastrianism into the hymn of praise of a natural religion. »Auf das Anschauen der Natur gründete sich der alten Parsen Gottes-Verehrung.»[2] The sun is in the centre of this cult of the natural elements. Again, the ancient Persians felt the awesome presence of the essence of life when they followed the endless nightly wanderings of the stars on the roads of heaven. To Goethe, Zoroastrianism was a religion which saw the gods as being in close relationship with the visible world, in the same way as the gods of Greece were.

---

[1] Goethe's knowledge of the Persian empires before the Moslem conquest comes from various sources. The Insel edition of *Noten und Abhandlungen* gives a list of the books that Goethe borrowed from the Weimarer Bibliothek and even dates when he borrowed them. When studying this list we come to the conclusion that Goethe's notions about Ancient Persia come probably from the following books: Hyde, Thomas, Historia religionis veterum Persarum, Oxford 1700. Malcolm, John, The History of Persia, Vols. 2, 1815. Herodotos, Geschichten, aus dem Griechischen übers. v. J. F. Degen, Frankfurt a.M.1783. Curtius Rufus, Leben Alexanders, (unknown edition). H. Anquetil-Duperron, Reisen nach Ostindien nebst einer Beschreibung der bürgerlichen und Religionsgebräuche der Parsen als eine Einleitung zum Zend-Avesta, dem Gesetzbuch der Parsen durch Zoroaster, transl. by J. J. Purmann, Frankfurt a.M. 1776. Chardin, Jean, Voyage en Perse et autres lieux de l'orient. Nouvelle édition augmentée . . ., T. 1—2, Amsterdam 1735. Tavernier, Jean Baptiste, Les six voyages . . . en Turquie, en Perse et aux Indes. T. 1—2, Utrecht 1712.

[2] W.-ö. Divan, p. 126.

According to Goethe, the followers of Zarathustra, like the Greeks, believed that all cosmic phenomena displayed the presence of a divine power. »Eine so zarte Religion, gegründet auf die Allgegenwart Gottes in seinen Werken der Sinnenwelt, muss einen eignen Einfluss auf die Sitten ausüben. Man betrachtete ihre Hauptgebote und -verbote: nicht lügen, keine Schulden machen, nicht undankbar sein!»[1] Goethe's idea of Zarathustra makes him seem very Hellenic, a man whose ethics demanded that he teaches all that is sensible and, in the human view, beautifully fulfilling its purpose. Goethe does not mention the transcendence of Zoroastrian doctrine. He makes it into a radiant Hellenic pantheism, forgetting the dualism, and elements of hazy polytheism of the Avestine world as revealed, for example, in the Yašt hymns. The Yašts are religious hymns in praise of the various deities of the Avestine world of gods. The hero of the tenth Yašt is Mithra, whose cult became very widespread during the time of the Caesars. He was especially worshipped by soldiers and merchants. In Yašt 14, the Avesta speaks of another deity, Vərəthraghna, the spirit of victory which is identical with Indra of the Indians. This deity revealed himself in many guises: the wind, an ox, a mount, a camel, a 15-year old youth, a bird of prey, a goat and a soldier. It is true that the Avesta shows a tendency to study nature. (»Der Dichter schaut gerne in die Natur und beobachtet das Leben der Tiere, Vögel und Vierfüssler.» J. Rypka, Iranische Literaturgeschichte, p. 11.) One wish of the anonymous writer was for sight as keen as the vulture's, who

»flies over eight countries
and yet immediately sees a piece of meat
the size of a fist».

(Yašt XIV, 33. Wolff.)

The main theme of the Avesta has been seen by many orientalists in the battle where all good powers unite against evil, and finally win.[2]

[1] W.-ö. Divan, p. 128.

[2] A. T. Olmstead, History of the Persian Empire, Chicago 1948, pp. 99—100. »Has Mazdah the power to protect his prophet, when the two hostile armies come together in battle? To whom will he grant the victory? Let there be signs to make known the healing judge. How shall he attain his goal, union with Mazdah himself?» About transcendent features in Zarathustra's teaching see J. Rypka, Iranische Literaturgeschichte, pp. 5—16.

The Avesta is shot through with the concept of the end of the world attended by a great war that must be waged by the many divinities if evil is to be conquered. This transcendental scene differs from the picture given by Goethe of Zoroastrian doctrine.[1]

---

[1] »Erst der französische Gelehrte Abraham Hyacinthe Anquetil Duperron versuchte nach seinem Aufenthalt in den indischen Parsenkolonien, wo er die zarathustrische Religion bei dortigen Priestern kennen gelernt hatte (1758—1761), eine erste Übersetzung der awestischen Texte (1771). Die skeptischen Forscher des 18. Jh. erklärten aber seine Übertragung für eine Fälschung, wobei sie annahmen, sie sei aus einer zeitgemässen aufklärerischen Vorliebe für die moralischen Lehren der morgenländischen Weisen hervorgegangen.» J. Rypka, Iranische Literaturgeschichte, pp. 16—17. Anquetil Duperron's work belongs to those books which Goethe borrowed from Weimarer Bibliothek. It is possible that his hellenizing ideas about Zarathustra come from this source, among others. J. Duchesne-Guillemin writes in his Western Response to Zoroaster, p. 15: »Meanwhile, Voltaire's or Diderot's attitude was to survive essentially unchanged: to a Goethe in his *Parsee Nameh* (*West-östlicher Divan*, with *Noten* on the Ancient Persians), to a Byron in *Childe Harold*, to a Wordsworth in the *Excursion*, the Persian religion remained the model of a natural, reasonable religion, later corrupted by priestly fanaticism.» Burdach accepts readily Goethe's view on Zoroastrianism. Burdach speaks with enthusiasm of ». . . die Verherrlichung der reinen Natur- und Lichtreligion des sterbenden Parsen . . .» (K. Burdach Vorspiel, vol. II, p. 359). He sees the ethical and prophetic mission of the Divan to coincide with Goethe's views on Zoroastrianism.

»Wenn wir in das Freie schreiten,
Auf den Höhen, da ist der Gott!

Dieses Fest gilt dem Urphänomen der Religion, wie es im Divan das 'Vermächtnis altpersischen Glaubens' ausspricht: Gottes Thron am Morgen zu verehren in der über dem Gebirg aufgehenden Sonne.

Aus solch echtester Religiosität ist der Divan entsprungen, . . .» (Vorspiel, II, p. 365.)

Burdach brings forth opinions of orientalists to corroborate his views. »Moderne Forschung lehrt — ganz im Sinne Goethes —, wie der nationalpersische Einschlag in dem erstarrten und verknöcherten Islam der Araber eine Vertiefung und ein freieres Leben erzeugte. In dem grossen und langen Kampf zwischen persischer und arabischer Kultur und Stammesanlage ist das Persertum das Licht und Menschlichkeit bringende Element. Besonders betont dies G. Jacob, Beiträge zur Kenntnis des Derwischordens der Bektāschis (Türkische Bibliothek Bd. 9), Berlin, Mayer und Müller, 1908, dazu wichtige bestätigende Belege von P. Horn aus Firdusi und Attar: D. Litztg. 1908, 22. August, Sp. 2139 f.» (Vorspiel, II, p. 344, footnote.)

In this chapter, Goethe also expresses his admiration for the ancient Persians who according to him were never influenced by the Indian manner of worshipping numerous idols. He cites as opposites the two cities of Balḫ and Bāmyān, geographically close but, according to him, poles apart in their worship. In Bāmyān numerous idols were worshipped, while in Balḫ men served elements, especially the purest of them, fire.

It may be found surprising that Goethe has what seems such a clear resentment of the culture of India. He had at his disposal translations of the greatest masters of Indian literature.[1] Parts of Kālidāsa had been translated, and Goethe's driving enthusiasm had led him to study the poetry of this part of the world. An excellent example of the fruits of this is the ballad *Der Gott und die Bajadere*, inspired by Indian mythology. Taking into account the importance of this poem among Goethe's works it is difficult to understand the strong antipathy towards Indian culture which he expresses in *Noten und Abhandlungen* as anything else but a limitation. While Goethe had made a profound study of Persian-Arabic culture, and made it an organic part of his conception of the world, India alone was left out.

It is clear that, as regards quality, the achievements of Indian literature fully stand comparison with their counterparts in Persia. There are even some essential similarities: one might compare the sensual and stylistic hyper-refinement of Kālidāsa and its correspondence in the works of Ḥāfiẓ. Yet in *Noten und Abhandlungen* Goethe appears indifferent to Indian literature, and treats Indian culture with contempt.

»*Regiment*«

Here, as in many other chapters of *Noten und Abhandlungen*, Goethe tries to penetrate the psychology of the Persians by studying their private and political customs. He notes that they are characterized by vindictiveness and corruption, and accuses the Near Eastern princes of bellicose quarrelsomeness. Persian discord, as

[1] According to the Insel edition list of Goethe's readings e.g. Kālidāsa's Meghadūta and Śakuntalā were known to him.

shown by Goethe, reminds the reader of the petty vengefulness of Renaissance princes. In these Eastern princes we meet the desire for revenge multiplied. Goethe would have come nearer to the truth had he spoken of the absolute enslavement to a sense of honour, passion and the spirit of the vendetta which has governed the Middle East right up to our times.

In this chapter Goethe also speaks of the extreme cruelty of recruiting methods. Here again we are left guessing at his true aims. It may be asked why, if the text is not clear, is the aim worth guessing? Goethe's work always contains such deep reflections that the effort of solution is never in vain. In speaking of the thirst for revenge and the strict military service, Goethe is very probably trying to prove the extremist character of the Middle East, its lack of restraint in passion which is not merely a matter of theory, but is applied in everyday life.[1]

»Geschichte»

Some chapters of the Noten may seem quite irrelevant to Ḥāfiẓ, who is, after all, our theme. Yet this work of Goethe makes an attempt to handle the sociological and aesthetical principles of Persian literature. Thus many parts of Goethe's study are necessary to an understanding of Ḥāfiẓ, not simply those sections that deal with him alone.

In the previous chapter Goethe has tried to analyze the course of the Persian wars. He tries to be extremely impartial. Now that keen admirer of the Greeks tries to understand the Persian way of thinking. He tells us that they found it impossible to accept any concept of gods living in houses, acting in a human manner. They were used to respecting the divine power in the movements of the stars and the fury of the elements, such as fire.

In passing from the Achaemenid period to the Sassanid period, Goethe remarks that the art of the latter tended to emphasize the power and splendour of the ruler in a way that did not, apparently,

---

[1] »Ein Greis liefert drei Söhne, er bittet, den jüngsten vom Feldzuge zu befreien, der König sendet ihm den Knaben in Stücken zerhauen zurück.» W.-ö. Divan, p. 131.

appeal to him, because of its pomp. According to him, these features were due to the Western pattern to which the Sassanids adhered closely in their art. The four and a half centuries dominion of the Persian Arsakids, Hellenistic to a great extent, had bound the Persians closely to the Occident. As Western art had suffered a decline, so too had the Eastern art that imitated it. In speaking of the Sassanid period, Goethe admits ». . . dass ein Volk auf einer hohen sittlich-religiösen Stufe stehen . . .», but as regards art, this people ». . . in Bezug auf Künste noch immer unter die barbarischen gezählt werden kann.»[1]

In the same chapter Goethe sets himself a very modern and demanding programme. His aim is to discover, without exaggerating, the value of Neo-Persian poetry, »so that», as he says, »one need not later be ashamed».[2] »Ebenso müssen wir auch, wenn wir orientalische und besonders persische Dichtkunst der Folgezeit redlich schätzen und nicht, zu künftigem eignem Verdruss und Beschämung, solche überschätzen wollen, gar wohl bedenken, wo denn eigentlich die werte, wahre Dichtkunst in jenen Tagen zu finden gewesen.»[3]

Despite his caution Goethe does, very soon, put forward some rash opinions. He returns to his favourite subject, the formlessness of the Hindu world of thought. He thinks that all Hinduism was 'Ungunst', from which, fortunately, the Persians knew how to free themselves, as they had a closer example in the Greeks. This is a rather bizarre thought. Did Rūdakī and Ferdousī actively fight against Hindu influence when writing their great works?

»*Mahomet*»

At the start of this chapter Goethe feels impelled to defend his discussion of a prophet when the chief aim of *Noten und Abhandlungen* is poetry. He studies the difference between a poet and a prophet and gives what is, in my opinion, an excellent comment on this subject. His estimation is Aristotelian, trying to find the universal in both species. He shows the prophet and the poet as their essential

[1] W.-ö. Divan, p. 133.
[2] W.-ö. Divan, p. 133.
[3] W.-ö. Divan, p. 133.

nature demands they should be, and explains the main differences. In Aristotle's Poetics we find the idea that phenomena should be represented not in their accidental and individual form but as typical to the species, universal, repeated time and again.[1]

»Wollen wir nun den Unterschied zwischen Poeten und Propheten näher andeuten, so sagen wir: beide sind von einem Gott ergriffen und befeuert, der Poet aber vergeudet die ihm verliehene Gabe im Genuss, um Genuss hervorzubringen, Ehre durch das Hervorgebrachte zu erlangen, allenfalls ein bequemes Leben. Alle übrigen Zwecke versäumt er, sucht mannigfaltig zu sein, sich in Gesinnung und Darstellung grenzenlos zu zeigen. Der Prophet hingegen sieht nur auf einen einzigen bestimmten Zweck; solchen zu erlangen bedient er sich der einfachsten Mittel. Irgend eine Lehre will er verkunden und, wie um eine Standarte, durch sie und um sie die Völker versammeln. Hierzu bedarf es nur, dass die Welt glaube; er muss also eintönig werden und bleiben; denn das Mannigfaltige glaubt man nicht, man erkennt es.«[2]

This is an Aristotelian explanation for the idea of a poet which, on closer consideration, is valid for most poets. »Alle übrigen Zwecke versäumt er, sucht mannigfaltig zu sein, sich in Gesinnung und Darstellung grenzenlos zu zeigen.» W. H. Auden, pondering over the lack of money Baudelaire always complains of in his letters, wondered why he did not apply for a job. Goethe's definition may perhaps explain why Baudelaire preferred to spend his time differently. Of course we meet many kinds of poets in the history of literature. There are poets who have a prophetic mission, and sometimes prophets write like poets. Moreover, not all poets are unsocial like Baudelaire. Still, Goethe is looking for the typical in the species of poet and prophet and the existence of mixtures does not totally invalidate his observations.

In speaking of Mohammed, Goethe's contempt for the »grenzenlose Tautologien und Wiederholungen» of the Koran is clear, but he

[1] Aristotle's striving towards the typical of a species is not only found in his Poetics but also in his Metaphysics: »Aristoteles übersieht dabei, dass die Unterscheidung von Idee und Erscheinung keine Trennung in substantieller Hinsicht bedeutet, sondern lediglich eine Trennung des Einzelfalles vom Gesetz.» Max Apel, Philosophisches Wörterbuch, Berlin 1950, pp. 25—26.

[2] W.-ö. Divan, pp. 134—135.

admits that though these may at first seem repulsive, they come to arouse amazement and, finally, respect.

It is clear, however, that Goethe's image of Mohammed is an improvement on that of the famous psychologist Lange-Eichbaum.[1] Lange-Eichbaum quotes two other scholars on Mohammed: »Gerade durch seine unerschütterliche Selbstsicherheit übt er einen dämonisch ergreifenden Einfluss auf seine Umgebung aus . . . Weder Joseph Smith noch Muhammed sind überragende Persönlichkeiten gewesen.«

Finally, Goethe makes a remarkable observation on the relation of Mohammed to Persian literature. He thinks, not quite correctly, that the *Arabian Nights* tales are Persian in origin, and says these stories have no ethical message, »den Menschen nicht auf sich selbst zurück, sondern ausser sich hinaus ins unbedingte Freie führen und tragen. Gerade das Entgegengesetzte wollte Mahomet bewirken.«[2] This observation seems rather strange when we think of the aesthetic enjoyment derivable from these short stories. We do not think of demanding that they should have an ethical content, masterpieces that they are. But, on closer consideration, it is evident that Goethe's remark is correct. They lack the ethical teaching or practical lesson contained in the Aesophian fable, *Hitopadesa* and *Panchatantra*.

»*Fortleitende Bemerkung*«

Of all Goethe's *Noten*, this chapter is the one which, were he speaking of art proper, would bring him close to the theory of Hippolyte Taine on the influence of environment on art: »Physisch-klimatische Einwirkung auf Bildung menschlicher Gestalt und körperlicher Eigenschaften leugnet niemand, aber man denkt nicht immer daran, dass Regierungsform eben auch einen moralisch-klimatischen Zustand hervorbringe, worin die Charaktere auf verschiedene Weise sich ausbilden. Von der Menge reden wir nicht, sondern von bedeutenden, ausgezeichneten Gestalten.«[3]

Goethe goes on to describe the representatives of various forms of governmental systems. These descriptions are close to Aristotle's

[1] W. Lange-Eichbaum, Genie, Irrsinn und Ruhm, München 1935, p. 412.
[2] W.-ö. Divan, p. 137.
[3] W.-ö. Divan, p. 139.

doctrines, as is his tendency to search out typical characteristics of each kind. Aristotle also thought that the idea of every being was to act in accordance with its true characteristics as much as possible.[1] The description of anarchy is particularly suited to the Oriental countries where anarchy often reigns, anarchy of a passion far beyond the petty feuds of Renaissance kings. »Gerät ein Staat in Anarchie, sogleich tun sich verwegene, kühne, sittenverachtende Menschen hervor, augenblicklich gewaltsam wirkend, bis zum Entsetzen, alle Mässigung verbannend.»[2] This is an accurate description, which extends to cover all types of revolutionary characters in literature right up to Strelnikov in Pasternak's *Doctor Zhivago*.

Goethe attempts to present in a favourable light characters developed by a tyrannical and despotic government. Even here he tries to find an ideal type: »Die Despotie dagegen schafft grosse Charaktere; kluge, ruhige Übersicht, strenge Tätigkeit, Festigkeit, Entschlossenheit, alle Eigenschaften, die man braucht, um den Despoten zu dienen, entwickeln sich in fähigen Geistern und verschaffen ihnen die ersten Stellen des Staats, wo sie sich zu Herrschern ausbilden.»[3]

In Goethe's day the European spirit had not yet shown what forms of despotism it was capable of producing. A later observer has difficulties if he tries to see the good in some of the characters shaped by phenomena such as Nazism. Goethe's ideas seem to be the ideal image of the enlightened European monarch of his time. At least in the days of Ḥāfiẓ despotism produced in the politics of Persia few if any great characters. The Muzaffarid family provides a sad chapter in Persian political history. It may well be doubted whether Ḥāfiẓ' friends, the sultans and vezires, could be called great; not even Ḥāfiẓ himself possesses all these qualities: 'kluge, ruhige Übersicht, strenge Tätigkeit, Festigkeit, Entschlossenheit.' At times Ḥāfiẓ even had to plead for favour, as happened during the disfavour of Šāh Šugā'. The question inevitably arises of how Ḥāfiẓ even managed to stay alive through the rule of five or six quick-tempered, bloodthirsty kings in the small province of Fars. It is strange that Goethe seems never to have been struck by the fact that the new ruler never took offence at

[1] M. Apel, Philosophisches Wörterbuch, pp. 25—26.
[2] W.-ö. Divan, p. 139.
[3] W.-ö. Divan, p. 139.

Ḥāfiẓ who, changing patrons with no difficulty, wrote songs of praise for the new king just as he had done for the old. Here we find a characteristic of Persian poetry which has eluded Goethe's attention. The mighty accepted the panegyric as a matter of course, seldom questioning its truth. Besides, poetry was so much loved in Persia, much more than ever in Europe, that the very rhythm, the language, the splendour of metaphor sufficed to enchant, distracting any thought of analytically searching for the truth. One might conclude that Ḥāfiẓ in untruthful. This is irrelevant. Ḥāfiẓ is one of the few Persian writers to have a true niche in world literature. For greatness of spirit, then, he can be said to break the bonds of national literary conventions, extending his aim beyond greedy panegyrics to the realm of what is best in poetry.

»*Dschelal-ed-din Rumi*«

This chapter is an interesting illustration of Goethe's relation to Persian poets. Rūmī, who had spent most of his life in Konya, began to study Sufism under local teachers. A wandering dervish, Šams-e Tabrīz, exerted an overpowering influence on him. He even published his own collected poems under his teacher's name. Rūmī founded the *Mevlevī* order of monks, which later achieved political power in the Osman empire. He was the most important mystic of the Persian-speaking world. His *Maṯnavī* is the presentation of a mystical system. His style is characterized by descriptive glamour and authentic mystical inspiration.

The student is puzzled to find Goethe feeling the same contempt for Rūmī as for Indian literature. In extenuation it may be said that Rūmī's importance was not as clearly recognized in Goethe's time as now. He was accepted as possibly the greatest of the Persian mystics, but his importance to world literature was not yet defined. Rūmī has been called the Dante of the Middle East; he has been understood, like Dante, as the fulfiller and best interpreter of a particular phenomenon of literature. In our time Muhammad Iqbal and his disciples have laid great emphasis on the importance of Rūmī.

Older European orientalists like Joseph von Hammer[1] are, as

[1] Geschichte der schönen Redekünste Persiens, Wien 1818, pp. 55—56.

Goethe says, given to such comparisons as saying that Ferdousī is the Homer of Persia and Ḥāfiẓ its Horace. If we were tempted to continue this line of comparison (which, as we shall see, Goethe condemns) we might suggest that Rūmī is the Dostoevski of Persia. This may, if at least temporarily accepted, help to clarify Rūmī's position. Rūmī's belief in the reality of transcendental occurrences is so firm that we are sometimes persuaded that here is the absolute truth. Dostoevski may be said to have the same feature. Both have similarly abandoned stylistic niceties and use straightforward language, taking its strength from its dramatic qualities rather than a skilful use of niceties.

It is strange that Goethe can find no contact with Rūmī. After his years in Italy, the ageing Goethe had become more inclined to mystical thought.

The key to the world of the later Goethe, in fact, lies in a kind of mysticism, a mysticism different from that of Rūmī. The power upholding the *West-östlicher Divan* is the love mysticism of *Buch Suleika*. In *West-östlicher Divan*, Goethe's diction becomes less and less precise. This mysticism of his latter years is founded, not on philosophical but on verbal mysticism. These features are present in the hazy, half-understood sentences of the *West-östlicher Divan*, sentences of the kind Goethe found in Hammer-Purgstall's Ḥāfiẓ translations. These have many Oriental Baroque features, so tortuous that no mind, not even Goethe's, has been able to follow them. In one sense, Goethe has been able to follow his paragon Ḥāfiẓ through to the end. Here and there in *West-östlicher Divan* there are poems which are similarly abstruse, with an abstruseness of language rather than of philosophy, although allusions to undefined mysticism play an important part.

(An Hafis)

. . .

Wie Wurzelfasern schleicht ihr Fuss
Und buhlet mit dem Boden;
Wie leicht Gewölk verschmiltzt ihr Gruss,
Wie Ost-Gekos' ihr Oden.

Das alles drängt uns ahndevoll,
Wo Lock an Locke kräuselt,

In brauner Fülle ringelnd schwoll,
Sodann im Winde säuselt.

Nun öffnet sich die Stirne klar,
Dein Herz damit zu glätten,
Vernimmst ein Lied so froh und wahr
Den Geist darin zu betten.

Und wenn die Lippen sich dabei
Aufs niedlichste bewegen,
Sie machen dich auf einmal frei,
In Fessel dich zu legen.

Der Atem will nicht mehr zurück,
Die Seel zur Seele fliehend,
Gerüche winden dich durchs Glück
Unsichtbar wolkig ziehend.[1]

. . .

Goethe was averse to the budding German Romanticism, he remained silent on Hölderlin's poems, shunned the brilliant plays of Kleist, took offence at Heine's scheme to write a new *Faust*, ignored Novalis. Byron's noisy conceits, however, won his approval, even his admiration.

Try as he might, Goethe could not wholly avoid the touch of Romanticism. The second part of *Faust* is of a vagueness at least equal to that of the German Romantics. Perhaps the only difference is that the mysticism in the second part of *Faust* has no systematized philosophical basis. Unlike Novalis' *Heinrich von Ofterdingen*, the second part of *Faust* is not the literary application of a specific philosophical doctrine.

Goethe's tendency towards mysticism in his later years is undeniable.[2] If the second part of *Faust* is interpreted as the development

[1] W.-ö. Divan, p. 24.

[2] »Kun Goethe elämänsä lopulla lähtee päättämään draamansa, kulkee Faustin tie kohti mysteeriota, kohti suurta kosmillista ratkaisua.» V. A. Koskenniemi, Goethe, keskipäivä ja elämänilta, p. 439.

»Auch das ist schon gesagt, dass im zweiten Teil vieles dunkel und unverständlich bleibt.» ». . . , die Ausdrucksweise hat etwas Gespreiztes und Verschnörkeltes, der vielberufene 'Alterstil' Goethes macht sich spürbar». A. Bielschowsky, Goethe, Bd. 2, pp. 671—672.

of a selfish worshipper of beauty and a defiant searcher into an unselfish man working for the benefit of mankind, this is only part of the truth. Here we have the problem of a single poetic experience split into two in a strange way. The simple doctrine of a practical man has been shrouded in obscurity of expression. Here we certainly have a trend towards mysticism. Has not the end of the second part of *Faust* been entrusted to the Chorus Mysticus?

Goethe's own mysticism did not disarm criticism. Faust I was followed by numerous Faust IIs. The vast collection of non-Goethian Fausts is divided into two parts, which E. M. Butler[1] analyzes in detail. He distinguishes the Fausts after and the Fausts before Goethe's version. Even before the publication of Faust II, or of its predecessor the Helena fragment, a number of non-Goethian Faust IIs had appeared. Perhaps the most important of the Fausts to follow Goethe are that of Nikolaus Lenau (1836), and Heine's opera libretto.

Faust II, also, found dozens of imitators. One of the most amusing in its satire, so rare in German literature, is Deutobold Symbolizetti Allegoriowitsch Mystifizinsky's *Faust: Der Tragödie Dritter Teil.* Lurking behind the fantastical pen-name we find the famous aesthetician F. T. Vischer (1807—1887), who was one of the founders of the modern study of aesthetics. Vischer's Faust is a piquant addition to our idea of its writer as the great systematizer of aesthetics. It is spirited, clever, un-German, unmetaphysical. Let us quote Vischer's version of *Alles Vergängliche ist nur ein Gleichnis:*

Chorus Mysticus

Das Abgeschmackteste
hier ward es geschmackt;
Das Allervertrackteste
hier war es bezweckt;
Das Unverzeihliche
hier sei es verzieh'n;
Das ewig Langeweilige
führt uns dahin.

[1] E. M. Butler, The Fortunes of Faust, Cambridge 1952.

It remains surprising that Goethe, with his own mystical bent, is so strong in his condemnation of Rūmī's mysticism. One of the characteristics of Rūmī's poetry is that it lives almost completely beyond the tangible world. Existing and living in union with God is, in fact, Rūmī's only theme.

Another surprising feature is Goethe's condemnation of the man who is one of the very few Persian poets who can be called courageous. Goethe often complains in *Noten und Abhandlungen* that Ḥāfiẓ and other Oriental poets often bow to despotism and let their poetry speak, as it were, from under the tyrant's lash. Let us consider, for example, the sections *Despotie*, *Einrede* and *Nachtrag:*

»Was aber dem Sinne der Westländer niemals eingehen kann, ist die geistige und körperliche Unterwürfigkeit unter seinen Herren und Oberen, die sich von uralten Zeiten herschreibt, indem Könige zuerst an die Stelle Gottes traten. Im Alten Testament lesen wir ohne sonderliches Befremden, wenn Mann und Weib vor Priester und Helden sich aufs Angesicht niederwirft und anbetet, denn dasselbe sind sie vor den Elohim zu tun gewohnt. Was zuerst aus natürlichem frommem Gefühl geschah, verwandelte sich später in umständliche Hofsitte. Der K u - t u, das dreimalige Niederwerfen dreimal wiederholt, schreibt sich dort her. Wie viele westliche Gesandtschaften an östlichen Höfen sind an dieser Zeremonie gescheitert, und die persische Poesie kann im ganzen bei uns nicht gut aufgenommen werden, wenn wir uns hierüber nicht vollkommen deutlich machen.

Welcher Westländer kann erträglich finden, dass der Orientale nicht allein seinen Kopf neunmal auf die Erde stösst, sondern denselben sogar wegwirft irgendwohin zu Ziel und Zweck?

Das Maillespiel zu Pferde, wo Ballen und Schlägel die grosse Rolle zugeteilt ist, erneuert sich oft vor dem Auge des Herrschers und des Volkes, ja mit beiderseitiger persönlicher Teilnahme. Wenn aber der Dichter seinen Kopf als Ballen auf die Maillebahn des Schachs legt, damit der Fürst ihn gewahr werde und mit dem Schlägel der Gunst zum Glück weiter fort spediere, so können und mögen wir freilich weder mit der Einbildungskraft noch mit der Empfindung folgen.«[1]

»Um uns nun über das Verhältnis der Despoten zu den Ihrigen, und wiefern es noch menschlich sei, einigermassen aufzuklären, auch

[1] W.-ö. Divan, pp. 161—162.

uns über das knechtische Verfahren der Dichter vielleicht zu beruhigen, möge eine und die andere Stelle hier eingeschaltet sein, welche Zeugnis gibt, wie Geschichts- und Weltkenner hierüber geurteilt. Ein bedächtiger Engländer drückt sich folgendermassen aus:

'Unumschränkte Gewalt, welche in Europa durch Gewohnheiten und Umsicht einer gebildeten Zeit, zu gemässigten Regierungen gesänftiget wird, behält bei asiatischen Nationen immer einerlei Charakter und bewegt sich beinahe in demselben Verlauf. Denn die geringen Unterschiede, welche des Menschen Staatswert und Würde bezeichnen, sind bloss von des Despoten persönlicher Gemütsart abhängig und von dessen Macht, ja öfters mehr von dieser als jener. Kann doch kein Land zum Glück gedeihen, das fortwährend dem Krieg ausgesetzt ist, wie es von der frühsten Zeit an das Schicksal aller östlichen schwächeren Königreiche gewesen. Daraus folgt, dass die grösste Glückseligkeit, deren die Masse unter unumschränkter Herrschaft geniessen kann, sich aus der Gewalt und dem Ruf ihres Monarchen herschreibe, so wie das Wohlbehagen, worin sich dessen Untertanen einigermassen erfreuen, wesentlich auf den Stolz begründet ist, zu dem ein solcher Fürst sie erhebt.'

Wir dürfen daher nicht bloss an niedrige und verkäufliche Gesinnungen denken, wenn die Schmeichelei uns auffällt, welche sie dem Fürsten erzeigen. Fühllos gegen den Wert der Freiheit, unbekannt mit allen übrigen Regierungsformen, rühmen sie ihren eigenen Zustand, worin es ihnen weder an Sicherheit ermangelt noch an Behagen, und sind nicht allein willig, sondern stolz, sich vor einem erhöhten Manne zu demütigen, wenn sie in der Grösse seiner Macht Zuflucht finden und Schutz gegen grösseres unterdrückendes Übel.»[1]

»Diese Betrachtungen zweier ernsten, bedächtigen Männer werden das Urteil über persische Dichter und Enkomiasten zur Milde bewegen, indem zugleich unsere früheren Äusserungen hiedurch bestätigt sind: in gefährlicher Zeit nämlich komme beim Regiment alles darauf an, dass der Fürst nicht allein seine Untertanen beschützen, sondern sie auch persönlich gegen den Feind anführen könne.»[2]

These quotations make it clear that Goethe was terrified by the submissiveness and defeatist mood of Persian poetry.

---

[1] W.-ö. Divan, pp. 163—164.

[2] W.-ö. Divan, p. 166.

Had Goethe studied Rūmī more throughly he would have found a poet who knelt before no worldly might or authority. He would have met a courageous poet, who would not admit defeat. Rūmī's poetry often utters a battle cry, an invitation to struggle against the apparent values of life. It would never enter his head to beg alms of princes.

In his ethic poetry Rūmī is the opposite of Ḥāfiẓ. It is also interesting to note that his straightforward ethics and his straightforward language and style go well together. Unlike Ḥāfiẓ, Rūmī is almost always logical in his poetry. All in all, it would appear that Goethe's study of Rūmī was superficial. Otherwise he would surely have had more understanding for this great mystic.

One characteristic of Rūmī's poetry may have helped to make it seem strange to Goethe. Rūmī always speaks as though from another world. His themes are almost always those of the beyond, ecstasy, the road of the mystic, abstention from temporal pleasures, subduing worldly joys.

Goethe was in general opposed to excess of any kind. His negative attitude towards Heinrich von Kleist is well known. Kleist tried to make contact with Goethe, wrote to him, even lived in Weimar, but, good dramatist as Kleist was, Goethe was not interested, since he sensed the extremism and pathological features of Kleist's character.

Rūmī's perpetual sojourn in the beyond may well have seemed strange to Goethe, may well have blinded him to all the virtues which he missed in the works of other Persian writers and could have found in Rūmī.

If we try to take an objective, modern standpoint we find that there is indeed something strange in Rūmī's poetry. In our efforts to understand Rūmī's transcendental existence we are faced with the wall of modern man's inability to really understand the Sufi's existence in unity with God. We cannot even understand how they reached this unity. Our own contact with the Sufic *fanā*, the nirvana of the mystic, slips through our fingers as we go further back in the history of Persian literature. Yet this *fanā*, or nirvana, is an intermediary form even in Persian letters today. The great Moslem classic of our times, Muhammad Iqbal (d. 1938), even claims to have seen Allah. A student asked him how he knew Allah existed. To this Iqbal replied, »I have seen him».

An actual annihilation, disappearance into nirvana, is rare in

Iqbal's work. What we see is a kind of intermediate state. Iqbal understands *fanā* well, and interprets it in his poems. Yet his poems, unlike those of Rūmī, do not actually exist in *fanā*.

»*Hafis*»

In this part of his study Goethe has a long discursus on the name Ḥāfiẓ, the epithet of anyone who knows the Koran by heart. He calls Ḥāfiẓ Scheich, Sofi, Derwisch. He feels that knowing the Koran is in itself a guarantee of wisdom, because of all the good teachings that will then be kept in mind. The attributes of Ḥāfiẓ that are mentioned makes Goethe's image of him rather religious. Then he says, »Mit solchen ernsten Studien, mit einem wirklichen Lehramte stehen seine Gedichte völlig im Widerspruch, der sich wohl dadurch heben lässt, wenn man sagt: dass der Dichter nicht geradezu alles denken und leben müsse, was er ausspricht, am wenigstens derjenige, der in späterer Zeit in verwickelte Zustände gerät, wo er sich immer der rhetorischen Verstellung nähern und dasjenige vortragen wird, was seine Zeitgenossen gerne hören.»[1] He clearly suspects that the life Ḥāfiẓ describes is not the one he lived. From this he develops a kind of play-theory of poetry, and adapts it to Ḥāfiẓ: ». . . ebensowenig braucht gerade der lyrische Dichter dasjenige alles selbst auszuüben, womit er hohe und geringe Leser und Sänger ergetzt und beschmeichelt.»[2] This play theory, borrowed from Schiller,[3] is interesting evidence of Goethe's knowledge of Schiller. Still, calling Ḥāfiẓ' poetry a play is not quite to the point, as is evident: »Auch scheint unser Dichter keinen grossen Wert auf seine so leicht hinfliessenden Lieder gelegt zu haben, denn seine Schüler sammelten sie erst nach seinem Tode.»[4]

This quotation gives the impression that Ḥāfiẓ wrote his poems in the same spirit as Goethe his Roman Elegies. The famed poet and Geheimrat neglected his Faustina, whose vertebrae his fingers indifferently numbered in the quiet of the Roman night. Goethe's

[1] W.-ö. Divan, p. 150.
[2] W.-ö. Divan, p. 151.
[3] K. S. Laurila, Johdatus estetiikkaan, Porvoo 1911, p. 233.
[4] Noten und Abhandlungen, p. 151.

Roman elegies are too light to compete successfully with their models, the elegies of Propertius. And Ḥāfiẓ' attitude was not usually as light towards his poems as was Goethe's towards his Roman poems.

šakkar šekan šavand hama ṭūṭiyān-e Hind
zīn qand-e pārsī ke be Bangāle mīravad
ṭayy-e makān bebīn o zamān dar sulūk-e šiʿr
kīn ṭifl-e yakšaba rah-e yaksāle mīravad

[All the parrots of India are become sugar-breakers
through this Persian candy on its way to Bengal.
Behold the annihilation of space and time in the pilgrimage of poetry,
this babe, a single night old, is set on a year's journey.]

This is clearly the word of a poet aware of his calling. This same certainty is observable in the final lines of Ḥāfiẓ' poems, those two lines in which the poet is immortalized and the themes of the poem gathered and rounded off.

ḥasad če mībarī ey sust naẓm bar Ḥāfiẓ
qubūl-e ḫāṭir o luṭf-e soḫan ḫudādādast

[Why are the poetasters so jealous of Ḥāfiẓ?
It is God-given, the gift to please by subtleties.]

If we weigh the social content of Ḥāfiẓ' poems as it appeared to the poet himself, and the little information recent research has added to our knowledge of his life, it is clear that if Ḥāfiẓ was dependent on some profession it was that of the poet, not of the professor of Koran exegetics. Ḥāfiẓ could be a very subjective poet; this appears in the frequent mention of fear, almost of *Angst*, in his poems. To quote the first poem of Ḥāfiẓ' *Divan:*

šab-e tārīk o bīm-e mouǧ o gerdābī čenīn hāyil
kuǧā dānand ḥāl-e mā sabukbārān-e sāḥilhā

[Dark the night, the waves and turmoil breed anxiety.
What do they know of my plight, who carry light burdens along the shore?]

This human fear and insecurity cannot, it seems to me, be described by ». . . ebensowenig braucht gerade der lyrische Dichter dasjenige alles selbst auszuüben, womit er hohe und geringe Leser und Sänger ergetzt und beschmeichelt».

»Im Engen genügsam froh und klug, von der Fülle der Welt seinen Teil dahinnehmend, in die Geheimnisse der Gottheit von fern hineinblickend, dagegen aber auch einmal Religionsübung und Sinnenlust ablehnend, eins wie das andere; wie denn überhaupt diese Dichtart, was sie auch zu befördern und zu lehren scheint, durchaus eine skeptische Beweglichkeit behalten muss.»[1] This, with the chapter *Allgemeinstes*, forms the basis for H. Schaeder's synthesis of Goethe's relations to Ḥāfiẓ.

»Es kommt nun alles darauf an zu erkennen, dass in diesem scheinbar spielerisch geistreichen Hereinziehen religiöser, insbesondere mysticher Motive eine Stilabsicht des Dichters, ja vielleicht die ihn eigentlich beherrschende Stilidee zu finden ist. Sie wird verdunkelt und zerstört, wenn das Gleichgewicht, das sie zwischen den beiden Bereichen des Sinnlichen und des Übersinnlichen herstellt, zugunsten eines der beiden Elemente aufgehoben wird.»[2]

We have already noted that, for Ḥāfiẓ, poetry was not always play. Aḥmad Kasravī is right in saying that when speaking of the pleasures of alcohol Ḥāfiẓ becomes as heated as if someone were trying to rob him of his inheritance. It is clear that Ḥāfiẓ was no stranger to these pleasures; it is equally clear that Ḥāfiẓ was genuinely interested in Sufism, Islamic mysticism.

When Goethe says that Ḥāfiẓ was a social type, whose main interest was in social success, he is surely mistaken. Nevertheless, with the insight of genius, he has observed Ḥāfiẓ' struggle to overcome the dualism presented by hedonism and Sufism. Ḥāfiẓ' imperishable victory is that he was able to raise hedonism to a level which is spiritually so high that at times it is virtually indistinguishable from true Sufism. Ḥāfiẓ never became a true Sufist like Rūmī. He never tried to attain the complete abstraction and detachment of the Sufis, but developed a brilliant form of language and style that lies between Sufism and hedonism. His main problems, then, were stylistic rather than philosophical. If we are to speak of his *Weltansicht*, then we

[1] W.-ö. Divan, p. 151.

[2] H. H. Schaeder, Goethes Erlebnis des Ostens, Leipzig 1938, pp. 120—121.

must say that his true philosophy was wordly, but his sympathies for Sufism were strong.

I believe with Schaeder that Ḥāfiẓ' poetic ideal was a stylistic balance between the material and the mystical. To decide that he was either mystic or rationalist is to disrupt this supreme balance.[1]

I have wanted to show that there are nuances in the *Weltansicht* of Ḥāfiẓ, details which hide behind Schaeder's neat theory of supreme balance. There are sides of Ḥāfiẓ, not mentioned by Goethe, which are noted in the essays of Ralph Waldo Emerson. Emerson's views on Ḥāfiẓ are made clear in Farhang Jahanpur's *Oriental Influences on the Work of Ralph Waldo Emerson.*[2] Emerson deals with Persian poetry with an independence worthy of his greatly admired master Goethe.

Emerson was attracted to Eastern literature at the age of seventeen. He started to learn German specifically in order to be able to read Goethe. In 1844 he first met von Hammer's translations. He wrote two essays on Persian literature, *Persian poetry* and *Introduction to the Gulistan* (1865).

Emerson chose Sa'dī as his ideal because of this poet's wide experience. He wrote two poems on him, *Saadi* and *Fragments on the poet and the poetic gift.* He also translated some 20 Persian poems (700 lines), mainly from German sources.

Emerson's ideas on the independence of Ḥāfiẓ are very similar to those of Goethe. I quote Farhang Jahanpur's study:

»Another admirable quality which Emerson finds in Ḥāfiẓ is his spiritual independence and the power of overcoming his surroundings.

---

[1] According to Wellek's History of Modern Criticism (Vol. 1: 210—211) Goethe ». . . is apparently the first to draw the distinction between the symbol and allegory in the modern way . . .» A paper, »Über die Gegenstände der bildenden Kunst», in the new journal Die Propyläen (1797) explains the new theory. When object and subject coincide, symbol arises. Symbol represents the collaboration of man and thing, artist and nature, assumes the profound harmony between the laws of the mind and those of nature. Symbol works indirectly, without commentary, while allegory is the daughter of the understanding.» These ideas are related to Goethe's image of Ḥāfiẓ' poetry. Ḥāfiẓ' relation to the transcendental world was that of a symbolist poet, and Goethe's view was that this relation needed no allegorical explanation, like the wine of Rūmī.

[2] Diss. Hull 1965.

He writes: 'The other merit of Ḥāfiẓ is his intellectual liberty, which is a certificate of profound thought . . . Wrong shall not be wrong to Ḥāfiẓ, for the name's sake. A law or statute is to him what a fence is to a nimble schoolboy, — a temptation for a jump. 'We would do nothing but good, else would shame come to us on the day when the soul must fly hence; and should they deny us Paradise, the Houris themselves would forsake that, and come out to us.' His complete intellectual emancipation he communicated to the reader. There is no example of such facility of allusion, such use of all materials. Nothing is too high, nothing too low, for his occasion. He fears nothing, he stops for nothing. Love is a leveller, and Allah becomes a groom, and heaven a closet, in his daring hymns to his mistress or to his cupbearer. This boundless character is the right of genius.'»[1]

»Nothing is too high, nothing too low, for his occasion». Emerson, like Goethe, has noticed this ability to bring together things which in themselves are far apart. This subject will be discussed more throughly in connection with the chapters *Allgemeines* and *Vergleichung*, pp. 110, 125—126.

Emerson has some notions about Ḥāfiẓ which Goethe has not mentioned. Emerson calls Ḥāfiẓ thousand-eyed, someone who sees too far. ». . . He is not scared by a name or a religion. He fears nothing. He sees too far, he sees throughout; such is the only man I wish to see and to be . . .. He is restless, inquisitive, thousandeyed, insatiable, and like a nightingale intoxicated with his own music; never was the privilege of poetry more haughtily used.» Here he must mean one particular quality in Ḥāfiẓ, the terrifying and total absence of any clearcut moral values of any kind. One is reminded of the poem where Ḥāfiẓ tells how his lover comes to the house, drunk, his hair dishevelled, sweat on his forehead, and asks him to make love. If this is moral teaching, it is strange. It is justified only by Ḥāfiẓ' fantastic ability to bend to any philosophical attitude. He could be at once homosexual, drunk and yet sublimely detached from anything which is normally associated with these states.

Goethe and Emerson are proof that the orientalists are not always the only experts on their Oriental subjects.

---

[1] Farhang Jahanpur, Oriental Influences on the Work of Ralph Waldo Emerson, Diss., Hull 1965.

We now come to the question of whether Goethe's ideas on the ambiguity of Ḥāfiẓ' style are in accordance with more recent work in Ḥāfiẓ studies.

Knowledge of the life of Ḥāfiẓ has been largely shaped today by the studies of Qāsem Ġanī[1] and Roger Lescot.[2]

Ġanī has arranged Ḥāfiẓ' poems in accordance with the contemporary events and personalities. An accurate dating of verses enables us to fit Ḥāfiẓ' poems into the chronology of the sultans of his time.

This is the first attempt — which Ġanī made apparently unaware of the great import of his work — to arrange any of Ḥāfiẓ' poems in chronological order. Only now is it possible to speak of the chronology of the poems of Ḥāfiẓ.

It is well known that Ḥāfiẓ was dependent on his princes. It comes as quite a surprise, however, to find that a quarter of all his poems are dedicated to the princes or vezires of the time. As well as dedicating his ghazals to the princes, Ḥāfiẓ eulogized them, as he tells us himself.

dar se sāl ānče biyandūḫtam az šāh o vazīr
hama barburd yakdam falak-e čūgānī

[All that I gained in three years
through the largesse of shah and vezire,
has been taken from me at a stroke by the polo stick of fate.]

Roemer asks, in *Probleme der Hafizforschung und der Stand ihrer Lösung*, just how the fact of Ḥāfiẓ' being a eulogist has escaped notice for centuries. The answer, as he says, is not simple. For one thing, Ḥāfiẓ did not call his princes by their true names. He conceals their identity under names understandable only to contemporaries. In his epoch-making study *Essai d'une chronologie de l'oeuvre de Ḥāfiẓ*, Roger Lescot has identified some of these names. One of them was the most important of Ḥāfiẓ' life — *šāhsuvār*, the master rider. The Persian name *šāhsuvār* is a translation from Abū'l-fawāris, the Arabic nickname of the sultan Šāh Šuǧā'.

The ghazal had existed for five centuries before Ḥāfiẓ. It was the classical form of the wine and love song, widely used by the Sufis.

[1] Baḫt dar āṯār va afkār va aḥvāl-e Ḥāfiẓ.
[2] Essai d'une chronologie de l'oeuvre de Ḥāfiẓ.

Hāfiẓ' innovation here was that in his poetry the ghazals were dedicated to the Friend meaning, not the *Sāqī* of the mystical poems, but the patron. When we read of a king in the realm of beauty, it is not a Sufistic concept we must think of, but a living prince.

We have already noted how Goethe found the balance between the mystical and the material in Ḥāfiẓ' poetry, and concluded that if we decided Ḥāfiẓ was either mystic or materialist, this supreme balance was gone. After Lescot's studies it is for us to note that Ḥāfiẓ can unite to an indivisible whole mystical poetry, love poetry, and remunerative panegyrics. This last factor, remunerative panegyrics, did not occur to either Goethe or Schaeder.

Šāh Šuǧā' himself sets an example of politically active love poetry in a poem recently found by A. J. Arberry.[1] Here Šāh Šugā' imagines that he has made an eternal peace with his brother Maḥmūd, and addresses him in terms of a homosexual love poem. This mingling of *mamdūḥ* and *ma'sūq* therefore, is not a novelty used only by Ḥāfiẓ.

The concept of Ḥāfiẓ' detachment, introduced by Goethe, can be extended by applying it to the partly panegyrical, partly propagandistic poetry of the 14th century. Even in doing this, we must admit the great fertility of Goethe's ideas about Ḥāfiẓ, and consider that maxim of his: What is fertile is true.

»*Allgemeines*»

According to Goethe Persian poetry, like Oriental life, was a mixture of precious and cheap wares. He sees ». . . unübersehbare Breite der Aussenwelt und ihren unendlichen Reichtum. Ein immer bewegtes öffentliches Leben, in welchem alle Gegenstände gleichen Wert haben, wogt vor unserer Einbildungskraft, deswegen uns ihre Vergleichungen oft so sehr auffallend und missbeliebig sind.»[2]

Here Goethe may be referring to the same thing he had noticed and liked in Italy: people in the South (and even more in the East) live in closer contact with one another than the segregated Northerners. Goethe must have been aware that in the East poetry was and is a function of all social life, not simply the creation of a hermit mind.

[1] A Locust's leg, 1962.
[2] W.-ö. Divan, p. 154.

In his philosophical attitude, too, Goethe was right in comparing Persian poetry to an Oriental bazaar.

There are Persian writers who seldom deviate from their chosen subject to leap from one matter to another. Such men are Sufist poets like ʿAṭṭār and Rūmī, whose highly ethical attitude to poetry never deviates, but holds to its basic, moralistic course.

More worldly writers, like Saʿdī and Ḥāfiẓ, have a capricious way of writing, leaping from style to style. Goethe has struck a still deeper vein of truth about Ḥāfiẓ here, as we can see in the many poems of Ḥāfiẓ that begin or end quite grandly, as though lit by fleeting inspiration, while the rest of the poem makes the reader wonder why the creative thought or inspiration did not last through the whole sequence. For example:

ḫošā Šīrāz o vaḍʿ-e bīmiṯālaš
ḫudāvandā nigah dār az zavālaš

[Hail, Shiraz of the lovely plain,
God will ensure you do not perish.]

On the whole this poem is a very good example of the frills and furbelows of Ḥāfiẓ' poetry, as well as its verbal magnetism and depth. The first line,

ḫošā Šīrāz o vaḍʿ-e bīmiṯālaš

brings to mind Shiraz as our imagination sees it best, the Athens of Persian culture, the cradle of all good writers, whose fame never fades. The effect is largely due to the sonority of the words. The word *bīmiṯālaš* is given such eloquence by its rhythmic context that even its sense is extended.

The effect of the poem begins to diminish when we come to the following lines:

be-Šīrāz āy o feiḍ-e rūḥ-e qudsī
beǧūy az mardum-e ṣāḥib-kamālaš

[Come to Shiraz, seek from her perfect people the grace of God's holy angel.]

It is not only the imagery that has suffered. Some decline of rhythmic or sonic inspiration must be to blame. This single poem shows us the close juxtaposition of gold and dross. In my view the poet here tries to recommend Šīrāz although the original rhythmic lilt has been lost. The opportunity of reference to the original place-names has now been exhausted, and the poet turns to his more professional and more familiar theme, love poetry. This poem, which began as an apotheosis of his home-town, becomes one of Ḥāfiẓ' more conventional love poems.

Goethe himself was shaped by a period when French literature was dominant. He went through his *Sturm und Drang*, but this quite suddenly calmed down into admiration of the French classics and, through them, the antique world. From Schiller Goethe learned the epigram and the refined ballad, from his trip to Italy the sensual, but restrained Roman elegies. *Iphigenie* is the milestone of Goethe's classical period.

Later, Goethe was attracted by the formal ideals of French classicism. His introduction to Ḥāfiẓ led him to a world with completely different values, a world of bold opposites. Here he was led to face a problem which he tries to solve in the chapter *Allgemeines*. Had he thought of baroque poetry, either in Germany (where, true, it was insignificant) or elsewhere in Europe, he would have recognized Persian poetry as an old acquaintance.

In various contexts, T. S. Eliot has noted how the English baroque poets or metaphysical poets had succeeded in linking widely separated elements.[1] This complexity of feeling is characteristic of both Persian and modernistic poetry. T. S. Eliot's own *Waste Land* is the epitome of 'bazaar-type' poetry, with its variety of elements. For instance in the second part of *The Waste Land* we are suddenly removed from a boudoir to the atmosphere of a public house. At the end of the same part, in the midst of a trival conversation we meet the tragic words of insane Ophelia.

It might perhaps be assumed that such a 'style of many colours' is typical of all late styles. At least Goethe thinks so: »Der höchste

[1] »The poets of the seventeenth century, the successors of the dramatists of the sixteenth, possessed a mechanism of sensibility which could devour any kind of experience.» (Points of View, p. 71.)

Charakter orientalischer Dichtkunst ist, was wir Deutsche *Geist* nennen, das Vorwaltende des oberen Leitenden; hier sind alle übrigen Eigenschaften vereinigt, ohne dass irgend eine, das eigentümliche Recht behauptend, hervorträte. Der Geist gehört vorzüglich dem Alter, oder einer alternden Weltepoche. Übersicht des Weltwesens, Ironie, freien Gebrauch der Talente finden wir in allen Dichtern des Orients. Resultat und Prämisse wird uns zugleich geboten; deshalb sehen wir auch, wie grosser Wert auf ein Wort aus dem Stegreife gelegt wird. Jene Dichter haben alle Gegenstände gegenwärtig und beziehen die entferntesten Dinge leicht auf einander, daher nähern sie sich auch dem, was wir Witz nennen . . .»[1]

E. R. Curtius writes much to the same effect in his *Kritische Essays zur europäischen Literatur:* »Eliot ist im genauesten Sinn des Wortes ein alexandrinischer Dichter — so wie er heute aussehen muss und darf. Er ist zunächst ein gelehrter Dichter. Er kennt die Sprachen, die Literaturen, die Techniken. Er schmückt sein Werk mit den Juwelen des Zitats, mit den Reminiszenzen der Lektüre.»[2] This definition suits the poetry of Ḥāfiẓ very well. The linking up of the ideals of Ḥāfiẓ, Goethe and Eliot is discussed on pp. 93—94 and 104—105 of this study.

The road had been prepared for baroque in Persia by almost two thousand years. After Neo-Persian poetry had overcome its linguistic difficulties, it had to take a look at its ancient cultural background. Manūčehrī's poetry, in the early years of the 11th century, already had all the particular characteristics of Neo-Persian poetry: complexity, far-flung imagery, decorativeness. An important factor in this early maturity was that in a sense Persian poets carried on from a mature Arabic poetry. Persian poets were as familiar with Arabic as with their own tongue. One example of the good knowledge of Arabic poetry is Ḥāfiẓ' *heǧrān* period, the time of Šāh Šuǧā''s disfavour. Ḥāfiẓ' ghazals of this period are heavily interlaced with Arabic: often only the middle lines are Persian.

In *Allgemeines*, Goethe also notes how Persian poetry produces still life studies equal to any Dutch masterpiece, while at the same time containing exalted ethical symbolism.

---

[1] W.-ö. Divan, p. 157.

[2] P. 302.

»Sie haben poetische Stilleben, die sich den besten niederländischer Künstler an die Seite setzen, ja im Sittlichen, sich darüber erheben dürfen. Aus eben dieser Neigung und Fähigkeit werden sie gewisse Lieblingsgegenstände nicht los; kein persischer Dichter ermüdet, die Lampe blendend, die Kerze leuchtend vorzustellen. Eben daher kommt auch die Eintönigkeit, die man ihnen vorwirft; aber genau betrachtet, werden die Naturgegenstände bei ihnen zum Surrogat der Mythologie, Rose und Nachtigall nehmen den Platz ein von Apoll und Daphne.»[1]

This evaluation is a little doubtful when applied to Persian poetry. Ḥāfiẓ' output has so much ethically indefinite, even libertine contemplation, that I think it unnecessary to include any moral aspect in Ḥāfiẓ' poetry. We are instead so accustomed to the confusion of the boundaries of Persian ethics that we are rather surprised at the ethical symbols Goethe finds in Persian poetry. An acquaintance with Jan Rypka's literary history of the Persians, Braginski's studies in the same field and Kasravī's nationalistic outbursts [2] indicates that the ethos of Ḥāfiẓ' poetry is exclusively a love of beauty in which all apparently ethical symbols simply serve an aesthetic cause.

Nevertheless, when Goethe speaks of the lamp — butterfly or rose — nightingale symbols as myths, he has seen Persian symbolism from an entirely new aspect, which gives us reason for re-evaluation. Is the opposition of lamp and butterfly, nightingale and rose simply a matter of convention, worn-out images to which writer gives a new interpretation, or is the Oriental conception of the staleness of a symbol different from ours? It seems to me that in the Orient a symbol is more durable than in the Occident. It is likely that here is reflected the contrast Goethe sees between symbol and myth on the one hand, and allegory on the other. Goethe writes: »When object and subject coincide, symbol arises . . . Symbol works indirectly, without commentary, while allegory is the daughter of the understanding. Allegory destroys the interest in the representation, in the object sensibly represented. Symbol suggests an ideal to the mind indirectly, it speaks to the senses by means of concrete representation.»[3] Goethe then would mean that the Persian 'myths' of the rose and the night-

[1] W.-ö. Divan, pp. 156—157.
[2] J. Rypka, Iranische Literaturgeschichte, pp. 262—263.
[3] R. Wellek, The History of Modern Criticism, vol. 1, p. 211.

ingale had not become stale during centuries, but were still able to carry the greatest aesthetic weight.

To the Orientals themselves, this lack of new imagery is of no importance. Even the great Persian poet of our times, Muhammad Iqbal, uses the well-worn lamp — butterfly, nightingale — rose symbolism. A traveller in the East today will notice the enthusiasm with which the outdated symbolism of old poetic images is received by the modern Oriental audience.

»*Allgemeinstes*«

In this chapter Goethe explains that irony belongs to a period of an ageing world. »Der Geist gehört vorzüglich dem Alter, oder einer alternden Weltepoche. Übersicht des Weltwesens, Ironie, freien Gebrauch der Talente finden wir in allen Dichtern des Orients.«[1]

The present century has in Europe been called the century of ageing. Proof of Goethe's idea is not far to seek in Occidental literature. Many of Mayakovski's poems, some parts of Eliot's *Waste Land* — these are the irony of an ageing world. Goethe gives a detailed treatment of how poets of later times, such as the Persians, ». . . beziehen die entferntesten Dinge leicht aufeinander, daher nähern sie sich auch dem, was wir Witz nennen; doch steht der Witz nicht so hoch, denn dieser ist selbstsüchtig, selbstgefällig, wovon der Geist ganz frei bliebt, deshalb er auch überall genialisch genannt werden kann und muss.«[2]

Goethe's aspirations to a definition of the properties of poetry in ageing periods is the first attempt to trace evolution in an Oriental literature; in fact he must be placed among the first evolutionists in the history of modern criticism. In theory, it would have been possible to arrive at a concept of ageing poetry in periods previous to Goethe. For example, in Arabic literature this phenomenon of an ageing literature growing complicated would have been clear in any comparison of, say, *Muʿallaqāt* poems and Mutanabbī's or Abū ʿAlā 'l-Maʿarrī's verse. In the preface to his history of the Arabs, Persians and Berbers which represents evolutionist ideas, Ibn Ḫaldūn (1332—

[1] W.-ö. Divan, p. 157.
[2] W.-ö. Divan, p. 157.

1406) does not touch the problems of evolution in the history of poetry.

In his *Concepts of Criticism* R. Wellek (p. 38) notes that there are many instances of concepts of literary evolution in classical antiquity. These ideas were taken up by the Renaissance, but according to Wellek there was no systematic application of them before the middle of the 18th century when the thoughts of Vico and Rousseau stimulated analogous thinking about literature.

Herder is among the first to study literature in the light of evolutionism.[1] Herder was much concerned about the primitive forms of literature and was a pioneer of the study of the beginnings of poetry.

Like Herder, Friedrich Schlegel assumed the principle of continuity. In his *Griechen und Römer* (1797) and *Geschichte der Poesie der Griechen und Römer* (1798) the evolution of Greek poetry is described as a cycle of growth, blossoming and decay.[2] *Noten und Abhandlungen* shows that Goethe belongs to the same school of ideas, but he has applied these ideas to a new sphere.

Goethe again returns to his theme of how, in an ageing environment, the writer's consciousness is more likely to connect widely disparate matters. Goethe himself well knew almost all sides of human life, from the turmoil of *Sturm und Drang* to the self-sufficiency of a Geheimrat, and from a Geheimrat's restraint to the sense of solar eclipse in the Marienbad elegy, and in this work of his later years he is largely concerned with the sovereignty that liberates and unites all these extremes.

»*Despotie*»

Here, as in previous chapters, Goethe's study continues on the basis of Persian literature. As in the chapters *Allgemeines* and *Allgemeinstes*, his deep knowledge of Ḥāfiẓ is always there in the background. It would be hard to convince us that Goethe planned his chapters round the work of Ferdousī, Niẓāmī or Rūmī. It must also be remembered that Ḥāfiẓ was the only Persian writer Goethe knew well.

Studies such as Goethe's *Noten und Abhandlungen*, dealing with

[1] K. S. Laurila, Johdatus Estetiikkaan, Historiallinen osa, p. 217.

[2] R. Wellek, Concepts of Criticism, pp. 39—40, and History of the Modern Criticism by same author, vol. 2, pp. 24—25.

the basic problems of the aesthetics of Persian literature, are very rare. In Jan Rypka's *Iranische Literaturgeschichte* (1959) the following aesthetic questions are posed, as the table of contents shows:

Einleitung
  Die neupersische Sprache
  Die nationale Individualität
  Konservatismus und Konvention in der neupersischen Literatur
Die Dichtkunst und ihre Formen
Übergewicht der Poesie
  Die äussere Form
  Die innere Form der Dichtung
Prosa
  Der Begriff der neupersischen Literatur
  Dichterische Stilarten
  Die Entwicklung der Literatur in politisch-historischer Abfolge
  Muhammad Bahārs Periodisierung der Prosa nach stilistischen Gesichtspunkten
  Die Periodisierung nach A. Zarre
  Die Quellen für die Gesichte der neupersischen Literatur

In the study of Persian literary history the time between Goethe and Rypka or, rather, Schaeder, is largely occupied with textual criticism or personalia. Even E. G. Browne, in his great work *A Literary History of Persia*, ignores the basic aesthetic questions. The pioneering nature of Goethe's work deserves emphatic stress.

One of Goethe's observations is something which has often tormented those lovers of the Orient only superficially familiar with their subject. Why does Persian poetry seem so dreary, even, to some repugnant, repeating as it does the same theme? For example, in his *Persian Grammar*, Reuben Levy is none too kindly disposed towards Ḥāfiẓ, allowing only two of his poems in the anthological section. Sir Charles Lyall writes: »Differences of school, which are made much of by native critics, are to us hardly perceptible.»[1]

[1] H. v. Glasenapp, Die Literaturen Indiens, Potsdam 1929, p. 227. Lyall was speaking of Urdu literature, but if applied to Urdu poetry, his statement could be applied to Persian literature as well.

Goethe has noticed this and other dangers facing readers of Persian poetry. »Was aber dem Sinne der Westländer niemals eingehen kann, ist die geistige und körperliche Unterwürfigkeit unter seinen Herren und Oberen, die sich von uralten Zeiten herschreibt, indem Könige zuerst an die Stelle Gottes traten.» [1]

Macaulay was among the first to express his resentment, forming an unfavourable opinion of Oriental literature which for him, in practice, meant Persian literature.[2] It was for Macaulay to decide whether Persian or English was better suited for use as the official language of India,[3] and this renowned historian, with his enlightened views, came to a conclusion whose level was scarcely above that of the conception of Europe and its culture of the great Arab travellers of mediaeval days.

Goethe sees the foundation of despotism in the normal need to yield before seniority. This feeling later developed into a system of complex conventions.

»Nicht aber allein vor dem Sultan, sondern auch vor Geliebten erniedrigt man sich ebenso tief und noch häufiger».[4] Goethe sees how the general yielding to despotism was transferred to the field of love poetry, too. He remarks, pertinently, that the development of Persian literature which he describes is the result less of the decline of customs than of poetic language. In his own life Ḥāfiẓ did not bow to despotism more than Rūdakī did in his day. The use of language in poetry had just become more complex.

»Orientalischer Poesie Ur-Elemente»

I have been trying to highlight Goethe's merits in explaining the basic laws of Persian literature. It is sometimes, however, very difficult to follow his thoughts as he goes from the particular to the general. Goethe was intolerant of German romantics, but as he grew older he himself acquired qualities typical of the romantic writer, such as Schelling or the Schlegels. He loves vast generalizations and

[1] W.-ö. Divan, p. 161.

[2] H. v. Glasenapp, Die Literaturen Indiens, Potsdam 1929, pp. 38—39.

[3] V. A. Smith, The Oxford Student's History of India, Oxford 1913, pp. 212—213.

[4] W.-ö. Divan, p. 162.

often gets lost. I find it difficult to follow Goethe in this chapter when he looks for similarities between geography, the Middle Eastern landscape, and Arabic grammar.[1] »Schreitet man nun so fort und beachtet alles übrige Sichtbare: Berg und Wüste, Felsen und Ebene, Bäume, Kräuter, Blumen, Fluss und Meer und das vielgestirnte Firmament, so findet man, dass dem Orientalen bei allem alles einfällt, so dass er, übers Kreuz das Fernste zu verknüpfen gewohnt, durch die geringste Buchstaben- und Silbenbiegung Widersprechendes aus einander herzuleiten kein Bedenken trägt. . . . Wer nun also, von den ersten notwendigen Ur-Tropen ausgehend, die freieren und kühneren bezeichnete, bis er endlich zu den gewagtesten, willkürlichsten, ja zuletzt ungeschickten, konventionellen und abgeschmackten gelangte, der hätte sich von den Hauptmomenten der orientalischen Dichtkunst eine freie Übersicht verschafft.«[2]

Here are reflected Goethe's ideas about *Urformen* or primary forms, which Lentz has successfully studied. According to Goethe, language in itself is creative, and therefore constitutes a primary form, *Ur-Element*, which influences the poetry. In the same way Lentz[3] has found in *Noten und Abhandlungen* references to environmental factors which, too, belong to the primary forms that influence the

[1] J. Rypka in his *Iranische Literaturgeschichte* gives several reasons for the complex character of the Persian poetic language, e.g. Avestic tradition, Arabic puns, and even the letters which allure the writer to play with the words. »Einige Verzierungen erfreuen sich hingegen grösserer Beliebtheit, so z.B. der Parallelismus (muvāzane), vor allem aber die Hyperbel (mubālaġe) und überhaupt die hyperbolische Ausdrucksweise (iġrāq), welche wohl der ureigensten psychischen Veranlagung des Morgenländers entspricht und schon aus dem Avesta belegt werden kann . . . ' das schönste Gedicht — das verlogenste, und die trefflichste Rede — jene, in der übertrieben wird. Aus ungezählten Beispielen könnte bestätigt werden, was die Masslosigkeit dieser Bilder erkennen lässt: dass diese Poesie von dem rechten Verhältnis des dichterischen Ichs zur Welt, zu den Menschen, und zu sich selber nichts weiss, was den eigentlichen Charakter grosser Poesie ausmacht.' (Schaeder.) . . . Wortspiele entspringen zahlreichen Homonymen, vor allem aus der besonderen Struktur der arabischen Sprache, mit deren Wortschatz das Persische übersättigt ist. Auch die Schrift verlockt geradezu zu sprachlichen Spielereien.« P. 103. This strangely reminds us of Goethe's thoughts.

[2] W.-ö. Divan, p. 171.

[3] W. Lentz, Goethes Noten und Abhandlungen zum West-östlichen Divan, p. 112.

poetry. If we assume that Arabic grammar and desert scenes have something to do with the baroque style of the Neo-Persian poetry, we must admit that there is a gap of dialectical reasoning between the two phenomena, a gap which Goethe here has not filled. The next chapter *Übergang von Tropen zu Gleichnissen* gives hints as to what Goethe means.

»*Warnung*»

When knowledge of the Orient was something new, and the strange literatures of the East had to be made comprehensible to Europeans familiar with Greek and Roman literature, it often happened that orientalists compared the poets they wished to introduce to their contemporaries with Roman poets. This was partly in order to give some idea of the position held by the various Persian poets.

In part, this comparison was due to the joy of discovery with which the orientalist faced these literary phenomena, comparable in value with the classical authors already so familiar. Such conceptions are far less common now, and seen to us often old-fashioned.

Comparisons with the antique world were then quite common. Napoleon was compared to Alexander, because both waged war on the East. In the Orient, which in many ways still lives in the age of romanticism, there is still a desire to compare its own writers to those of Europe. Thus, literary critics call the Urdu writer Manto the Maupassant of Urdu. Vahid, the Pakistani literary scholar, ponders questions such as whether Iqbal is the equal or superior of Dante, Milton, Nietzsche. Goethe warns against such comparisons. He agrees that the comparison of Ḥāfiẓ and Horace may be just as regards conditions of living and similarity of era. But, in his view, comparison of Ferdousī or the *Nibelungenlied* to the *Iliad* only damages the cause of Ferdousī or the *Nibelungenlied*.

This kind of comparison is not, however, without its good points. It would be interesting to study what might be the differences and similarities between Ḥāfiẓ and Horace, and between Goethe's *West-östlicher Divan* and Muhammad Iqbal's 1923 imitation, *Payām-e Mašriq*.

Comparison between Goethe and Ḥāfiẓ would take us closer to the fourteenth-century Persian. When studied within his own frame

of reference he inevitably seems strange, his genius concealed by the literary conventions of his day. Many find themselves in the position of the perfectly well-educated English friend whom I introduced to Ḥāfiẓ in translation. His reaction was, »just a collection of romantic clichés».

Once the term world literature is accepted, it is the duty of the literary scholar to present all international literary phenomena in terms of world literature, to act so that world literature becomes, not just the sum of hundreds of completely different literatures, but also an organic entity, with some members more closely related than others. This relationship and the charting of the differences have frequently been discussed, but little progress has so far been made.

In his *Concepts of Criticism* René Wellek criticises the methodology of comparative literature: »I believe that the programmatic pronouncements of Baldensperger, Van Tieghem, Carré, and Guyard have failed in this essential task. They have saddled comparative literature with an obsolete methodology and have laid on it the dead hand of nineteenth-century factualism, scientism, and historical relativism.»[1] Wellek goes on: »The desire to confine 'comparative literature' to the study of the foreign trade of two literatures limits it to a concern with externals, with second-rate writers, with translations, travelbooks, 'intermediaries', in short it makes 'comparative literature' a mere subdiscipline investigating data about the foreign sources and reputations of writers.»[2]

Wellek goes as far as to say: »Far too much has been made of the 'authority' of the specialist who often may have only the bibliographical knowledge or the external information without necessarily having the taste, the sensibility, and the range of the non-specialist whose wider perspective and keener insight may well make up for years of intense application. There is nothing presumptuous or arrogant in advocating a greater mobility and ideal universality in our studies.»[3]

Wellek continues: »But true literary scholarship is not concerned with inert facts, but with values and qualities.»[4] »A work of art

[1] P. 282.
[2] P. 284.
[3] P. 291.
[4] P. 291.

cannot be analysed, characterized, and evaluated without recourse to critical principles, however unconsciously held and obscurely formulated.»[1]

What does Wellek want from a comparatist? »... Croce and his followers in Italy, Russian formalism and its offshoots and developments in Poland and Czechoslovakia, German Geistesgeschichte and stylistics which have found such an echo in the Spanish-speaking countries, French and German existentialist criticism, The American 'New Criticism', the myth criticism inspired by Jung's archetypal patterns, and even Freudian psychoanalysis or Marxism: all these are, whatever their limitations and demerits, united in a common reaction against the external factualism and atomism which is still fettering the study of comparative literature.»[2]

To all this can be said that the comparative method is very rare in Oriental studies and almost always limited to direct influence. Schaeder and Lentz are both comparatists with a historical and philosophical method. They show 'wide perspective' and 'keener insight' while studying the direct effect of the Orient on Goethe.

We can, however, think of another kind of comparison: comparing Oriental and Western works of art representing the same trends, studying the different sets of values, what is considered good taste, what is bad taste, what are the ethical attidudes in both cases, finding parallellism and analogies. This kind of comparison would strive towards a synthesis in literary ideas.[3]

In *Noten und Abhandlungen* Goethe compares many elementary facts.[4] This comparison of basic differences might well be continued. E.g. the sense of time is much less evident in Persian literature than in European. The German conception of *Zeitgeist* is relatively unknown. A single poem of Ovid contains far more of the sense of the typical phenomena of his time than any Persian poem can offer. To take one example:

> Simplicitas rudis ante fuit; nunc aurea Roma est
> et domiti magnas possidet orbis opes.

[1] P. 292.

[2] Pp. 292—293.

[3] This kind of comparative study is attempted by Unesco's major project on mutual appreciation of Eastern and Western cultural values.

[4] Allgemeines, p. 154, Despotie, p. 161.

adspice quae nunc sunt Capitolia, quaeque fuerunt;
alterius dices illa fuisse Iovis.
Curia consilio nunc est dignissima tanto;
de stipula Tatio regna tenente fuit.
quae nunc sub Phoebo ducibusque Palatia fulgent,
quid nisi araturis pascua bubus erant?[1]

Although the Roman writers are at a greater distance from us in time than the Persians now being considered, we can say that a Roman writer has given the typical features of his own time by comparing them clearly with earlier days.

Classical Persian writers have not the same sense of time. They seldom write of current problems. Their expressions are tied to a range of stylistic niceties which leaves very little freedom. Sometimes, indeed, Ḥāfiẓ speaks of the age of wolves and, referring to the unloved tyrant Mubārizu 'd-dīn, he uses the name *muḥtasib*, meaning a police alcohol inspector.

Another feature of division is the way in which European literatures have been affected by the experience of the personality, the unique self, as something extraordinary, an individual completely different from all others. This has often taken the outward form of a revolt. Its earliest interpreters are Rousseau, the representatives of *Sturm und Drang*, with the young Goethe and Schiller to the fore. During the romantic movement this experience of the self became a still persisting personality cult. In philosophy, its representatives include Stirner and Nietzsche. Rimbaud, pioneer of modernism, fought, as his letters show, against anything old. Baudelaire was the only poet senior to him whom he accepted. Modern existentialism has described the human being as living on the island of the self. This insight, the experience of self, has become an acute problem.

Persian classical literature affords no examples of such personal revolt. Revolt there is, but in the sphere of Islam it has a rather special character, the object being the faith itself. Mutiny began with the development of Sufism. One of its chief early exponents was Ḥallāǧ who was intoxicated by his mystical hallucinations and

[1] Ars amatoria, 3, 113—128.

declared *'anā 'l-ḥaqq*, I am God, caused grave offence, and was crucified.

The philosopher Ǧīlī, on the other hand, taught how when man approaches the mystical road of God he becomes like God, a perfect being. Persian literature is mainly rebellion against orthodox Islam. Its heroes are the *rend*, the drunkard, intoxicated by mystical wisdom, and the *qalandar*, the wandering beggar-philosopher.[1]

Ḥāfiẓ rebelled even more sharply than his predecessors against orthodox Islam.

»Es besteht kein Zweifel darüber, dass trotz aller mystischen Verschleierung die Alten in Ḥāfiẓ mit Recht einen Kāfir gewittert haben. Das bezeugen die Anekdoten vom verweigerten rituellen Begräbnis oder von der drohenden Vernichtung seines Grabes unter den *Safawiden*, Nachrichten die sicher ersonnen, dennoch im gedanklichen Kern wahr sind.«[2]

Despite the rebellion, it cannot be said that Persian literature has writers conscious of their own self before our own days and Muhammad Iqbal. Iqbal experienced the finding of the self so strongly that (through the study of Nietzsche and European literature) he dedicated his whole life and poetry to it. He stated that he himself, unlike his predecessors in Persian literature and Islamic philosophy, melted God into himself. In their *fanā*, earlier writers had been melted into God.

In romantic literature, the personality cult is first observable stylistically. Since the romantics, the demand of each new generation has been the renovation of style and stylistic individualism. The German romantics rebelled against French classicism; this expressed itself in ways such as the writing of poems in folk song measures and free hymn measures taken from the Greeks. Baudelaire and Rimbaud, again, began modernistic prose poetry.

We find no such compulsion towards new styles in Persian literature. The Arabic metres, dating from pagan times and found in Persia

---

[1] »... eine Weltanschauung, welche schon von der 2. Hälfte des 5/11 Jhr. an, insbesondere durch die Qalandarī-Dervische, entwickelt worden ist: unter der grundsätzlichen Voraussetzung der 'Herzensgüte' (ṭību 'l-qalb) gilt die šarī'a nur innerhalb bestimmter Grenzen.« Rypka, p. 262.

[2] J. Rypka, Iranische Literaturgeschichte, p. 263.

in the mid-ninth century, dominate Persian literature right up to the twentieth century, without any rebellious desire for innovation. The Persians did not accept the Arabic metres unchanged, they gave the system the quatrain or *rubā'ī*, but this addition did not have the character of personal rebellion.

An innovation of Ḥāfiẓ was, as we have seen earlier, the breaking of the continuity of thought in the ghazal, but this too was not an actual rebellion. The measures, themes and vocabulary of poetry remained constant right up to our own times. The Persian and Urdu writers speak this very day of the complaint of the nightingale. Muhammad Iqbal, the modern rebel of Persian literature, felt himself called to make some modest metrical innovations.

»*Vergleichung*«

In the previous chapter, «*Warnung*», Goethe warned against comparisons of European and Oriental writers. Now, in accordance with the new chapter heading, Goethe himself makes such a comparison. Here, as in some other parts of the *Noten und Abhandlungen*, Goethe realizes that the history of literature is indeed a paradox. First he says something that describes one aspect of the truth, then he realizes that the whole truth has not yet been laid bare.

Goethe thinks that within the field of German romanticism Jean Paul Richter has stylistic features in common with those of Persian literature.

»Ein so begabter Geist blickt, nach eigentlichst orientalischer Weise, munter und kühn in seiner Welt umher, erschafft die seltsamsten Bezüge, verknüpft das Unverträgliche, jedoch dergestalt, dass ein geheimer ethischer Faden sich mitschlinge, wodurch das Ganze zu einer gewissen Einheit geleitet wird.«[1]

Here, as in *Allgemeines* and *Allgemeinstes*, he once more states that the combining into a single entity of widely differing things is a characteristic feature of Persian literature. To prove this he gives a list of strange words chosen from the books of Richter.

»Barrieren-Traktat, Extrablätter, Kardinäle, Nebenrezess, Billard,

[1] W.-ö. Divan, p. 176.

Bierkrüge, Reichsbänke, Sessionsstühle, Prinzipalkommissarius, Enthusiasmus, Szepter-Queue, Bruststücke, Eichhornbauer, Agioteur, Schmutzfink, Inkognito, Colloquia, kanonischer Billardsack, Gipsabdruck, Avancement, Hüttenjunge, Naturalisations-Akte, Pfingstprogramm, maurerisch, Manual-Pantomime, amputiert, Supranumerar, Bijouteriebude, Sabbaterweg usf.»[1]

Once again it must be noted here that a literary critic, T. S. Eliot in fact, has remarked that the uniting of disparate materials is his own ideal style. His vision of this ideal came not from the East but from the West, from the English metaphysicals John Donne, Andrew Marvell and George Herbert. T. S. Eliot in fact discovered the metaphysicals, and it is thanks to him that they were removed from the category of odd poets and placed among the foremost English poets. T. S. Eliot writes:

»The poets of the seventeenth century, the successors of the dramatist of the sixteenth, possessed a mechanism of sensibility which could devour any kind of experience. They are simple, artificial, difficult, or fantastic, as their predecessors were, no less nor more than Dante, Guido Cavalcanti, Guinicelli or Cino. In the seventeenth century a dissociation of sensibility set in, from which we have never recovered . . .»[2]

It is interesting that Eliot (and after him some other 'new critics') [3] should use the term *wit* for that psychological factor which causes the changing of mixed material into a single whole in the poems of the seventeenth century metaphysicals.[4] Etymologically, this is the same word as *Witz*, which Goethe uses of the same phenomenon in connection with the Persian poets.

---

[1] W.-ö. Divan, p. 176.

[2] In Points of View, London 1941, p. 71.

[3] Elton's Glossary of New Criticism, p. 306.

[4] »The wit of the Caroline poets is not the wit of Shakespeare, and it is not the wit of Dryden, the great master of contempt, or of Pope, the great master of hatred, or of Swift, the great master of disgust. What is meant is some quality which is common to the songs in Comus and Cowley's anacreontics and Marvell's Horatian Ode. It is more than a technical accomplishment, or the vocabulary and syntax of an epoch; it is, what we have designated tentatively as wit, a tough reasonableness beneath the slight lyric grace.» T. S. Eliot, Points of View, pp. 73—74.

»Jene Dichter haben alle Gegenstände gegenwärtig und beziehen die entferntesten Dinge leicht auf einander, daher nähern sie sich auch dem, was wir Witz nennen; doch steht der Witz nicht so hoch, denn dieser ist selbstsüchtig, selbstgefällig, wovon der Geist ganz frei bleibt, deshalb er auch überall genialisch genannt werden kann und muss.»[1]

Eliot's works created a European school of poets to fulfil this stylistic programme in many countries.

Many of these poets have a surprising, strange vocabulary, related to everyday language, even slang. The reader's alertness is tested by the quick associations and flashing wit born of unexpected contrasts. Indeed, the word wit, in the sense in which Eliot uses it, applies to most poets of the modern movement from Arthur Rimbaud onwards. Goethe's *Witz* and Eliot's *wit* are almost identical in meaning.

Goethe's image of Persian poetry (which for him as I have mentioned on p. 94 mostly meant Ḥāfiẓ) and modern European poetry have much in common. This result links this study up with my first study which emphasized the analogy between Hāfiẓ and the modern movement in European poetry.

---

[1] W.-ö. Divan, p. 157.