

**Joseph v. Hammer Purgstall's German Translation of Hafez's *Divan*  
and Goethe's *West-östlicher Divan***

by

Masoomah Kalatehseifary

A thesis  
presented to the University of Waterloo  
in fulfilment of the  
thesis requirement for the degree of  
Master of Arts  
in  
German

Waterloo, Ontario, Canada, 2009

© Masoomah Kalatehseifary 2009

### **Author's Declaration**

I hereby declare that I am the sole author of this thesis. This is a true copy of the thesis, including any required final versions, as accepted by my examiners.

I understand that my thesis may be made electronically available to the public.

## Abstract

Johann Wolfgang von Goethe's *West-östlicher Divan* [*West-Eastern Divan*], which emerged from the author's interest in love poems of the fourteenth-century classical Persian poet Hafez, was the inspiration for this thesis. The overwhelmingly negative appraisal of the first translation of Hafez's entire *Divan* into German by Joseph Freiherr von Hammer Purgstall, which was used by Goethe in the composition of his own poems, sparked its research questions: How can the errors in Joseph von Hammer Purgstall's translation of Hafez's *Divan* be explained, and how did these inconsistencies affect Goethe's understanding of Hafez's poems? Despite contention about the accuracy of Hammer's version of Hafez, the translation inspired Goethe, who, feeling so much affinity for Hafez as to call him his 'twin brother', soon began to write poetry imitating Hafez's style in the process of cultivating his growing fascination for this classical Persian love poetry.

The thesis draws connections between the Hafezian elements of the original *Divan* and their reproduction in Goethe's cycle of poems by analyzing a selection of poems from Hammer's translation, considering Hammer's role as mediator, as well as comparing with these a selection of Hafez-inspired poems from Goethe's *West-östlicher Divan*. To this end, chapter one sets Hafez into the historical and artistic context of Persian poetry and introduces the formal aspects of Hafez's primary lyrical form, the *ghazal*. In this it focuses especially on technical aspects of rhyme and complicating elements such as the formal consideration of unity and the contextual consideration of mystical allusions. Further, this chapter familiarizes the reader with essential features of the linguistic and rhetorical peculiarities and traditions of the Persian language, as well as the *dramatis personae* of Hafez's *Divan*.

The analysis of Hammer's translations in the second chapter demonstrates both his successful renderings as well as his occasional deviations from the original, while addressing the difficulties he faced in transferring the linguistic peculiarities of the original to the target language. It also reviews the extent to which Hafez's philosophy remained intact in his version.

The third chapter focuses on the poems of Goethe's *West-östlicher Divan* in light of both Hammer's translation and Hafez's original. Taking about thirty poems into account, this chapter shows that Goethe's mastery in composing Hafez-inspired poems gives the reading audience an understanding of the poetry of that classical Persian figure without needing to read or understand the original text and it argues that the poems of his *West-östlicher Divan* enliven Hafezian literary patterns in the minds of readers who know the Persian poet and make them understandable for the uninitiated westerner. The analysis further elucidates how Goethe overcame the weaknesses in Hammer's version to reconstruct the fundamentals of Hafez's message.

## Acknowledgements

I would like to express my gratitude to my supervisor Prof. David G. John, whose passion and dedication to the field of the 18th and 19th century German literature inspired me the moment I got to know the department of Germanic and Slavic. I am honored to have gotten this opportunity to work with him. Prof. John, thank you for your belief in my strengths and your constant constructive comments through the process, without which this thesis would have remained a dream. Thank you for your encouragement in letting me develop my thoughts, which you helped me get on track.

I would like to thank my husband, Payam, who has encouraged me to pursue my studies and has given me his love and unwavering support through the ups and downs of life during the long research and writing process of this thesis.

My thanks go to the memory of my father.

My heartfelt thanks to my dearest mom, whose unconditional love and support for her family continue to astonish me.

Thank you to my brother and his family. If I hadn't had him, I would not have gotten the opportunity to enter the worlds of German language and Austrian culture.

I would also like to thank Mr. Mehran Rad and his family for their support during my research in the field of classical Persian poetry.

The topic, ideas and research in this thesis stem entirely from the author. The supervisor assisted in matters of grammar and writing style.

Sinnig zwischen beyden Welten

Sich zu wiegen laß ich gelten,

Also zwischen Ost und westen

Sich bewegen sey zum besten!

Goethe

|   |            |
|---|------------|
| <b>Table of Contents</b>  |            |
| <b>1. Introduction</b>  | <b>1</b>   |
| <b>2. Khajeh Shamseddin Mohammad Hafez-e Shirazi: Hafez</b>                           | <b>14</b>  |
| <b>2.1. The Complications of Hafez’s <i>Ghazals</i></b>                               | <b>16</b>  |
| <b>2.2. Mystical vs. Secular Implications of the <i>Ghazals</i></b>                   | <b>26</b>  |
| <b>2.3. Translatability of Hafez</b>  | <b>29</b>  |
| <b>3. Joseph Freiherr von Hammer Purgstall’s Hafez Translation and its Reception</b>  | <b>32</b>  |
| <b>3.1. An Assessment of Hammer’s Translation in Light of Goethe’s Poems</b>          | <b>37</b>  |
| <b>3.1.1. The Pivotal Function of Hafez’s <i>Rend</i>: His Rejection of Hypocrisy</b> | <b>38</b>  |
| <b>3.1.2. <i>Rend</i>’s Advocacy of Love and Wine</b>                                 | <b>45</b>  |
| <b>3.2. Conclusion</b>  | <b>55</b>  |
| <b>4. Johann Wolfgang von Goethe and his <i>West-östlicher Divan</i></b>              | <b>57</b>  |
| <b>4.1. Goethe’s Expression of Hafez’s Philosophy</b>                                 | <b>73</b>  |
| <b>4.2. Poem Analysis</b>   | <b>75</b>  |
| <b>4.3. Conclusion</b>  | <b>78</b>  |
| <b>5. Conclusion</b>  | <b>81</b>  |
| <b>Bibliography</b>   | <b>86</b>  |
| <b>Appendices</b>   |            |
| <b>Hafez through Joseph Freiherr von Hammer Purgstall’s rendering</b>                 | <b>94</b>  |
| <b>Hafez through Johann Christoph Bürgel’s rendering</b>                              | <b>102</b> |
| <b>Hafez through Vincenz Ritter v. Rosenzweig-Schwannau’s rendering</b>               | <b>103</b> |
| <b>Hafez through Johann Wolfgang von Goethe’s <i>West-östlicher Divan</i></b>         | <b>106</b> |

## 1. Introduction

Fifty years of poetic work by the fourteenth-century Persian classical poet Hafez resulted in the compilation of his *Divan*, a term used to designate the collected poems of a poet in eastern literature. Likened to other contemporaneous Persian art forms, including miniature painting (Rypka 101; Schimmel, *Stern* 44), Hafez's *ghazals* portray everyday life experiences that resonate with both eastern and western audiences, and make exceptional use of imagery. Some of Hafez's *ghazals* were first translated into Latin in the seventeenth century in Oxford and in Vienna. In later centuries many other translations appeared in a vast array of languages. Some scholars recognize the Vienna translation as the first translation in the history of Hafez scholarship, others Oxford's. Credit for the first European translation of Hafez's entire *Divan* is, however, accorded by universal consent of scholars to the Austrian diplomat and orientalist Joseph Freiherr von Hammer Purgstall (1774-1856) in 1814. Soon after this publication, the accuracy of his translation was questioned by other German orientalists including Johann Gottfried Kosegarten in Jena and Heinrich Friedrich von Diez in Berlin, which sparked a so-called "Gelehrtenstreit". (Shareghi 61) Hammer has been accused of rendering flawed reproductions of Hafez's *ghazals* in nearly every document that gives mention of his translation. The matter of his translation's accuracy has been debated since its appearance and has raised doubts about its reliability in presenting Hafez's poems to its readers.

I first became acquainted with Hammer's translation through the work of critics who judged it negatively, such as Konrad Burdach, Ali Radjaie and Annemarie Schimmel, and at that point I had only a passing knowledge of Goethe's *West-östlicher Divan*. My knowledge of both Persian and German led me to investigate whether such criticism was justified, and if it was, then to what extent Hammer's translation contributed regardless to our understanding of Hafez and



Goethe. This thus became the central research question for my thesis. I discovered that research on the correlation between Hammer's translation and Goethe's renditions of the *West-östlicher Divan* is very limited, and so too is the scholarship on the relationship between Hafez and Goethe in light of Hammer as "Vermittler d[ies]er literarischen Kommunikation" (Mina V). I had also become fascinated with the poems of Goethe's *Divan* themselves, and felt that as a Persian and German speaker I had unusual credentials to pursue research into them. More precisely formulated, my research began with the question: "How can the errors in Joseph von Hammer Purgstall's translation of Hafez's *Divan* be explained, and how did these inconsistencies affect Goethe's understanding of Hafez's poems?" My initial purpose was thus two-fold: to find the reported inadequacies in the translation of Hammer and their reflection in Goethe's *Divan*, and as a result of that initial reading, to bring the three writers together through a comparison of their works.

The analysis in the thesis elucidates the peculiarities and challenges of the Persian language in the process of translation and the inevitable consequence of the transformation of the original imposed upon the translator. These factors have not been addressed satisfactorily by critics who reject Hammer's translation as irrevocably flawed, nor even by the small group who respect his efforts. Hammer's objectors go so far in their judgment as to condemn the entire work as an "ungelenke ..., vielfach dunk[le] ... und durch Missverständnisse entstellte ... Uebersetzung" (Burdach 6), while supporters of the translation refer to his simplifications and neutralizations as minor deviations from the original (Mina 103). One notices here that both critical camps, despite their polarity, share recognition of the divergence between Hammer's translation and Hafez's original. Similarly, they both ignore the factors that caused this divergence, but conclude differently. The objectors fail for the most part to present an analysis

of the translation, and the supporters either take distance from any judgment through employment of a contemporary perspective (Tafazoli) or interpret the divergence of the translation as Hammer's intention to make the poems more comprehensible to the German-speaking reader. (Mina 103) Furthermore, while the non Persian-speaking critics do not consider the characteristic elements of Hafez's poetry which require acquaintance for a satisfactory understanding, the small Persian-speaking group consults these crucial elements only in passing. Dick Davis, in his essay "On Not Translating Hafez", explains the linguistic and cultural difficulties he as a translator of Hafez encountered. His essay is indicative of some of the problems Hammer coped with. Davis concludes that poets such as Hafez, who "develop a poetry's capabilities most tellingly... are often precisely those whom it is most difficult to bring over into another language" (318). He further calls the poetry of Hafez "by virtue of his very skill [,] to be monolingual [and] untransferable to a language and poetry which does not share [the same]... conventions" (318). Despite the existing difficulties, Hammer probably tackled the task with a lack of access to the materials required for an appropriate translation from a different linguistic culture (Radjaie 330), yet by doing so at least succeeded in enlivening Hafez in his native language. The literary birth he engendered marked an Hafezian renaissance in nineteenth-century German literature. This fact, which Hammer's critics often seem to willfully ignore, allows us to regard his translation as a paradigm in itself, a simplified model of the classical Persian poetry, which gave rise to many later sophisticated studies on this subject.

Johann Wolfgang von Goethe (1749- 1832), among the great Weimar literati, regarded Hammer's translation as a pioneering work despite the controversy over its accuracy. In spring 1813 through Hammer's translation he gained access to Hafez's entire body of work, whose poems had already captured his attention prior to the appearance of Hammer's version (Goethe,

SWM 11.1.2, 261), He read Hammer's renderings uncritically and treated them as a model for his acquaintance with Persian poetry, and as a result could say: "Doch alles was damals zu wünschen blieb ist uns jetzt in reichlichem Maße geworden, durch das unschätzbare Werk, das uns Gedichte persischer Dichtkunst überliefert"(SWM 11.1.2, 261-2). Soon after reading Hammer's translation, Goethe began to versify poems in an Hafezian fashion. He compiled his poems in his anthology *West-östlicher Divan*, published in 1819. He used Hammer's translation as the foundation of his work and invited his readers to do the same in the prose section of his *Divan*, where he said: "Gewiß besitzen wir nun ein Fundament, worauf die persische Literatur herrlich und übersehbar aufgebaut werden kann, nach dessen Muster auch andere Literaturen Stellung und Förderniß gewinnen sollen" (SWM 11.1.2, 262). The literary relationship between Goethe and Hammer has not captured great attention in the scholarship on either's work. The fact that the actual relationship between the two was limited to just a few letters has permitted readers uninterested in the connection to undermine its importance and conclude that "Niemals ist Goethe dem Menschen Hammer nähergetreten. Stets blieb eine spürbare Ferne" (Mommsen, *Goethe* 50). Hammer's critics and readers of the *West-östlicher Divan* believe this work to be a product of Goethe's own genius, but his profound understanding of Hafez was achieved through the veil of Hammer's version, as Paul Horn in his *Geschichte der Persischen Literatur* states: "Es ist überhaupt bewunderungswürdig, wie feinsinnig Goethe aus von Hammers Übersetzungen Hâfiz' [sic] Genie herausgeföhlt hat"(117). In addition, Goethe expanded his knowledge of the Orient through other resources, such as Saadi's *Golestan* and *Bustan* in Adam Olearius's translation, William Jones's *Poesis Asiatica*, Edward Scott Waring's *Reise nach Sheeraz*, von Dieze's translation of *Das Buch Kabus*, as well as travelogues by Pietro della Valle, Tavernier and Chardin, all of which enabled him to reflect his original source through the two hundred and

thirty-nine poems that he versified in the twelve books of his *Divan*<sup>1</sup>, his direct access to the *ghazals* of Hafez, however, remained through Hammer's translation, a work he described as "ein sehr verdienstliches Werk, und für [ihn] von großem Wert" (SWF 7, 452). Goethe's appreciation of Hammer for his translation is reflected in his notes, a document to which the readership of Hammer's translation has largely remained inattentive. Despite this oversight, Goethe's notes remain an indication of the great literary communication between these two personalities.

### **Process of selecting the poems**

The first step in selecting poems for close analysis in my thesis was to read all of Hammer's *Divan* translations and compare them to Hafez's poems. I then focused on those that have parallels in Goethe's *Divan*. Here, relying on my native knowledge of Persian culture, language and history, I underlined words, names, metaphors, phrases and motifs which are associated with the Orient and which gave signs of having given Goethe some inspiration linked to the original Persian version. This resulted in a list of approximately ninety names, words, phrases or themes. I then tracked these in Hafez's Persian *Divan*. Then I expanded the examination to the contexts of the words and phrases on my list by examining them in greater detail in Goethe's *West-östlicher Divan*. From this process of contextualization, a number of typically Hafezian themes emerged, so I began to prioritize those words and phrases on my list which were associated with them. Further, while reading Goethe's *Divan* in German, supplemented by a comparison of his poems with the first translation of them into Persian by Shojaeddin Shafa (1949), which provided a secondary check of context, I made a list of the

---

<sup>1</sup> Goethe's *Divan* consists of "Buch des Sängers", "Buch Hafis", "Buch der Liebe", "Buch der Betrachtungen", "Buch des Unmuts", "Buch der Sprüche", "Buch des Timur", "Buch Suleika", "Schenkenbuch", "Buch der Parabeln", "Buch des Parsen" and "Buch des Paradieses". Goethe explained the content of each book in the section "Künftiger Divan" of his "Besserem Verständnis", which follows the books (SWM 11.1.2, 201).

overall context of each poem. During the process of re-reading all of Goethe's *Divan* poems, I had the assurance of understanding the entire cycle. As a result, I listed about forty themes that in my mind reflect the inspiration from Hafez, passed on to Goethe. Given the formal constraints of my thesis, I decided to focus on ten of these to make my case, and reduced the number for intensive consideration (as listed below), with lesser reference to the others:

---

| Hafez's Themes                             | Sources in Goethe's <i>Divan</i>  |
|--|---|
| Hafez's poetry                             | "Elemente" (Appendix page 109)<br>"Jene garstige Vettel" (App. 112)<br>"Offenbar Geheimniss" (App. 114)<br>"Unbegrenzt" (App. 117)<br>"Wink" (App. 120) |
| Beloved's beauty                           | "An Hafis" (App.107)<br>"Geheimes" (App.110)<br>"Hatem, Ja" (App. 111)<br>"Hatem, Locken!" (App. 111)<br>"Versunken" (App. 118)                         |
| Difficulty of the way of love / separation | "Bist du" (App. 107)<br>"Wie sollt' ich" (App. 119)   |
| Wine/ Hatred of false zealots              | "Sie haben wegen" (App. 115)<br>"Was, in der Schenke" (App. 118)  |
| rend & rend-ness                           | "Freysinn" (App. 109)<br>"Wie ich so ehrlich war" (App. 119)  |
| Hafezian motifs                            | "Hatem, nicht" (App. 112)<br>"Kenne wohl" (App. 113)<br>"Suleika, hochgeglückt" (App. 116)  |

Hafezian characters

“Alleben” (App. 106)  
“Derb und Tüchtig” (App. 107)  
“Dichter” (App. 108)  
“Gewarnt” (App. 110)  
“Gruss” (App. 110)  
“Ist’s möglich” (App. 112)  
“Saki” (App. 114)  
“Suleika, ach!” (App. 115)  
“Suleika, was” (App. 116)  
“Was machst du” (App. 119)

I also make occasional reference to single lines from other poems.

The first chapter of the thesis introduces Hafez, explains the origin of his lyrical form *ghazal* and describes its formal aspects. The chapter addresses the sociopolitical circumstances of Hafez’s time as well as indications of his personal life reflected in his *ghazals*. Complicating factors of his poetry, such as the question of formal unity and mystical implications of the poems, are discussed. In this regard, the discussions underline the controversy of whether the unity of the *ghazals* lies in their formal characteristics or semantic structure. The proposers of the latter theory are those who like Jan Rypka see “each verse...in itself a completely worked out and independent miniature” (101), which, as suggested in chapter one, calls for a circular rather than a linear reading of Hafez’s poems. To this end, the chapter familiarizes the reader with the characteristics of Hafez’s poetry such as the *dramatis personae* of the *Divan*, Persian rhetorical devices he used, and the linguistic peculiarities of the Persian language, thus giving the reader the knowledge required for an understanding of comparisons made in the following chapters.

The second chapter examines Hammer’s treatment of these intricacies by comparing his translations with the original Persian in light of the Turkish edition of Hafez which the former used as the foundation of his work.<sup>2</sup> To exemplify the method used in the analysis within this chapter, I will now discuss briefly an Hafezian couplet in Hammer’s translation, to shed light on

---

<sup>2</sup> It should be mentioned that Hammer had parallel access to the original Persian along with the Turkish translation and commentary of Sudi. He also knew Persian.

some of the characteristics of his rendering in general. The following is the translation Hammer provided for the first line of *ghazal* twenty-two of the group *Dal*. The transcription of this line for comparison reads: *Gholaam-e narges-e mast-e to taajdaaraanand / kharaab-e bade-ye la'l-e to hoshyaaraanand*. Hammer's translation for this line is the following:

Herrscher sind die Sklaven von deinen Narzißen,

Weise sind berauschet von deinen Rubinen (Appendix [Hereafter App.] 97 "Herrscher", 1- 2).

In these lines, as in the whole poem, Hammer succeeded in creating two lines for each distich as in the original, while in the majority of his translations he created four lines for the two-line couplet of the original. Here he also constructed the rhyming pattern "-en" between the first two hemistichs, but does not sustain such compact and precise equivalents throughout the poem. The lack of a rhyming pattern consistent with the original *ghazal* can be recognized in the majority of Hammer's reproductions. With regard to the original semantics in this couplet, the rendering shows some deviations, which, despite their general accuracy, fail to convey fully the crafted aesthetics that unfolded in the mind of the Persian reader through the selection of some key words. The analysis in the second chapter shows such deviations as a strong characteristic of Hammer's rendering.

The following comparison demonstrates, in short account, the semantic intricacies used by Hafez, which deepened the complexity of Hammer's process of translation. In the couplet above, Hafez creates the Persian equivalent compound noun of *taajdaar*, 'Kronenhaber', instead of using the common term "Herrscher". This substitution allowed Hafez to create a rhyming pattern between this word and his selection of *hoshyaar*, for which Hammer chose "Weise". The two Persian words in Hafez, in contrast to the translation, appear as closing words in the original.

The flexibility of the word order is thus another characteristic of Hammer's translation, of which more examples are discussed in Chapter two.

In the rhyming pattern of *-aanand* in *taajdaaraanand* and *hoshyaaraanand* (rhyming patterns highlighted) the flexibility of Persian grammar gave Hafez the freedom to craft the rhymes in the verbs of his two lines, a freedom which Hammer did not have in the German language. This characteristic, which contributes to the acoustic quality as well as the formal structure of the original distich, is lost in the translation. Hammer reproduced the original verbs by using forms of "sein", and his pairing of "Herrscher" and "Weise" does not rhyme. In light of the function of the dramatis persona of Hafez's *Divan*, translating *hoshyaar* with "Weise" is also somewhat misleading. As we will see in chapter two, the "Weise" is one of Hafez's characters representing certain characteristics. "Nüchtern", in fact, would have transferred the original meaning, which also reconstructs the original contrast in addition to "berauschet". The original repetition is reconstructed in "deinen"; however, the adjective 'berauschend' of "Narzißen" is eliminated in the rendering, perhaps to create a harmony between the number of words in both lines. The analysis in chapter two shows this as an occasional occurrence in the rendering, for which there is at times no clear explanation. The analysis also indicates that the Persian rhetorical devices of the original are not fully transferred to the reproduction, as in the above couplet the device of *ihāam*, or ambiguity, crafted in *baadeh la'l*, gets lost in the rendering. It is not clear whether "Rubinen" communicates the rhetorical device of ambiguity that its Persian equivalent of *baadeh la'l* evokes in the mind of the Persian reader. Hammer's brief mention of "Rubinenmund" in his foreword (I: XXXIX) does not make the matter clear. The acoustic quality of the original, which is intensified by the rhyming halves of each distich, is further lost in most of the reproductions, as it is in the translation of this line (examples underlined below):



*Gholaam-e narges-e mast-e to taajdaaraanand / kharaab-e bade-ye la'l-e to hoshyaaraanand.*

The latter part of chapter two elucidates further whether the message of Hafez is transferred fully in the reproductions for the western reader.

The third chapter takes up the same question and examines first Goethe's understanding of Hafez in light of the previous chapter. It shows Goethe's compensation for the failure of Hammer's version by keeping Hafez's philosophy intact. In this vein, the discussion aims to highlight a selection of references in the *West-östlicher Divan* as containing fundamental elements of the Hafezian message. To this end, the discussion underlines Goethe's adaptation of Hafezian motifs, characters and metaphors, which contributed to his Persian-spirited verses and spontaneously shed light on his personal life. The chapter also discusses whether it is true, as Goethe scholarship has believed to date, that the poems are bereft of mystical implications, and also touches upon the formal aspects of the poems. It is also the underlying purpose of the third chapter to show that through the books of his *Divan*, Goethe presents his readers with eastern and western poetry with no demarcations to indicate their differences, so that they wonder about his "Technik der Vermischung und Überblendung" (Wild 75) without a "west-östliche Synthese in Form einer Verschmelzung der beiden" (Weber 24). Regardless of the controversy over the extent of the syntheses of these two different poetries, I argue that Goethe's German- and Persian-spirited verses are placed so peacefully together that it is as if they were from the same origin. Goethe explained the intention of this "Verknüpfung" to his publisher Cotta as follows: "Meine Absicht ist dabei, auf heitere Weise den Westen und Osten, das Vergangene und Gegenwaertige, das Persische und Deutsche zu verknüpfen, und beiderseitige Sitten und Denkart über einander greifen zu lassen" (SWF 7, 451). With this aim, through a spiritual Hegira, Goethe drew near to Hafez, resided in his homeland cognitively, and versified his last

large anthology. His *Divan* was a productive literary response to that of Hafez, and became a great inspiration to the savants of Weimar, who continued in his footsteps and thus embarked upon setting more examples of this newly originated notion throughout the century.

The core idea of Goethe's notion of "Weltliteratur" (Eckermann 198), coined in 1827, is doubtlessly the element that led to Hammer's Hafez translation and thus the *ghazal's* journey and subsequent settlement in western literature. The following is one of his widely quoted statements in this regard: "Wenn ich früher den hier und da in Zeitschriften übersetzt mitgetheilten einzelnen Stücken dieses herrlichen Poeten nichts abgewinnen konnte, so wirkten sie doch jetzt zusammen desto lebhafter auf mich ein, und ich mußte mich dagegen productiv verhalten, ..." (SWF 17, 259). Goethe's frustration with western political unrest caused by Napoleon which pervaded Europe, as well as his aspiration to expand the corpus of his 'national literature', were two factors that caused him to throw himself "auf das Entfernteste", find peace in Hafez's lyrics, and select "Schiras, [die] Gesellschaft der persischen Dichter, als den poetischen Mittelpunkt. ... von da [er seine] Streifzüge nach allen Seiten ausdehne[n konnte]" (Goethe, SWF 7, 398). Goethe not only saw Shiraz as an imaginative "Fluchort" (Weber 122) through which to convey his feelings of repulsion towards political tension in the west, but also as a "Projektions- und Spiegelfläche der eigenen Kultur" (Wild 74). He felt that it could stimulate his national literature. The outcome of Goethe's *West-östlicher Divan* is the result of his imaginative journey to the 'Fremde', combined with 'das Eigene' of his own culture.

Along with his *Faust*, Goethe's *Divan* has been regarded as "his most important and most personal work" by the well-known contemporary Goethe expert, Katharina Mommsen (*West VII*). Her introduction to John Whaley's complete translation of the *West-östlicher Divan*, in which she compares the *Divan's* "high moments of life... to Faust's jaded dismal

skepticism”(X), tempts the reader of both Goethe works to make a comparison between them. Looking closely at both, one sees a central theme emerge. In both, the wager centres upon a single pleasing moment; it is the search to find the true essence of life. The distinction is, however, the fact that in the earlier work the protagonist made a pact with Mephistopheles in his quest for an answer that remained undiscovered by the unsatisfied protagonist. By contrast, Goethe’s acquaintance with Hafez’s philosophy through his *Divan* caused him “eine wünschenswerthe Verjüngung” (Otto & Witte 306), something much more meaningful than the mere physical rejuvenation of Faust which resulted in the tragedy of that work. In 1829, Goethe summarized the difference between these two positions in his philosophical poem “Vermächtnis”, a legacy that he and his Persian “Zwilingsbruder” left as a perpetual message for their eastern and western audiences:

Genieße mäßig Füll’ und Segen,  
Vernunft sei überall zugegen  
Wo Leben sich des Lebens freut.  
Dann ist Vergangenheit beständig,  
Das Künftige voraus lebendig,  
Der Augenblick ist Ewigkeit. (Goethe, SWF 2, 686)

In Goethe’s words, this is the plain message of Hafez, a poet with a creed of love and wine, whose message divulges itself through his satisfaction in simple human pleasures and desires through the verses of his poems. This was a legacy that Goethe wished could stay alive among his countrymen through his *West-östlicher Divan*, as it did through Hafez’s verses. So he asked of his *Divan* readers in the “Besserem Verständnis”: “Der westliche Dichter... wünscht daß

seinem Büchlein gleiche Ehre wiederfahren möge” (SWM 11.1.2, 196), and closed his anthology by singing the same desire:

Nun so legt euch liebe Lieder

An den Busen meinem Volke. (SWM 11.1.2, 127)

## 2. Khajeh Shamseddin Mohammad Hafez-e Shirazi: Hafez

Despite his role as a distinguished court poet and teacher, very little is known about the life of this fourteenth-century classical Persian poet, whose love poems have provided inspiration to the West and daily guidance to the families of his home country for centuries.<sup>3</sup> “Hafiz [sic] is as highly esteemed by his countrymen as Shakespeare by [Westerners]”, writes Arthur J. Arberry in the introduction to his *Fifty Poems of Hafiz* (2) and mentions John Donne and Charles Lamb<sup>4</sup> as “the [two] Haafezian of the English authors” with regard to their lifestyle and attitude.

(*Classical Persian Literature* 359) Leaf calls Hafez “the representative of ‘romanticism’ in the fourteenth century” during the five centuries of the Golden Age of Persian poetry. (1) Despite his universal fame, scholars do not agree on Hafez’s dates of birth and death. Sources vary from 1317 to 1326 for the year of his birth, and 1389 to 1391 for the year of his death. Most Hafez scholars thus avoid attaching specific dates to his works and instead indicate a general time period.

Some scholars have been using the poet’s literary works as sources of evidence in mapping his personal and social history. Qasim Ghani, the twentieth-century Persian writer, embarked upon analyzing Hafez’s poems from an historical standpoint in the 1940s, as he believed historical information to be crucial in understanding the works of a poet under the influence of his/her social circumstances. (I: 19-21) Scholars have deemed Ghani’s volume a valuable and authentic source since its first publishing in 1942.

There was no *Divan* of Hafez’s poems until after his death. At this time, one of the poet’s disciples, Mohammad Golandam, knowing the value of the *ghazals*, compiled the poems

---

<sup>3</sup> Some people in the Persian-speaking world make an augury through Hafez’s *ghazals* by opening his *Divan* and reading a *ghazal* randomly, taking what they find as Hafez’s advice. Some believe that this is the reason the poet has been given the appellations “interpreter of secrets” and “hidden tongue”.

<sup>4</sup> Massud Farzad also sees in the essays of Charles Lamb “the most Hafezian style and standpoint among the English brethren of the pen” (25).

in alphabetical order according to the final letter of their rhyming words. Golandam's great effort, which resulted in the publication of his edition about twenty years after Hafez's death (Zarrinkub 13), has unfortunately failed contemporary scholars twofold. His lengthy, flowery preface to the *Divan* provides us with no information about Hafez's life, and, to compound the confusion, the unusual alphabetization of the poems has rendered it nearly impossible for scholars to construct historical events in them and has thus barred us from learning more about the poet's life through that means. Many sources have suggested that one of the reasons why Hafez did not compile his poems during his lifetime is that the poems were under constant revision during the fifty years in which he wrote them. The other reason for this, as Goethe points out to the readers of his *West-östlicher Divan* in the section "Besserem Verständniss", which serves as a commentary on his *Divan*, lies in the fact that Hafez did not regard his poems as highly as they have been regarded by his audience since their publication. (SWM 11.1.2, 164) Hammer's foreword about Hafez's biography shares the same logic. (I: XV-XVI)

Hafez was born in Shiraz, the Capital of Fars province, which witnessed a tremendous amount of insecurity and catastrophe during Hafez's lifetime. Despite the difficult social conditions, Hafez's love for his beloved hometown made him reluctant to leave it, and it is there that he was buried. His tomb is located in his beloved garden, *Mossalaa*, next to the river *Roknaabaad*. The three geographical entities – *Mossalaa*, *Roknaabaad* and *Shiraz* – are treated as *dramatis personae* in the poet's works.

Actually a pen-name, Hafez has been said to represent the writer's knowledge of the Quran by heart from its beginning to end. Goethe refers to "*bibelfest*" people of eighteenth-century Germany to explain the pen name of the Persian poet to his German readers. (SWM 11.1.2, 163) Hafez was also an appellation given to those who had a pleasant voice, and by this

logic, some scholars have suggested that he performed his poems to the court. These scholars are able to relate other personalities with the appellation “Hafez” around the same time as our poet to those with strong musical ability. In this regard, some of them believed in the unique musicality of the *ghazals* and even today the poems continue to be set to traditional Persian music. European composers have also found that even the translations and adaptations of the majority of *ghazals* are adaptable to musical settings. Franklin Lewis reports of the numerous accounts of European composers such as Erich Wolff (1874-1913) and Rudolf Bode (1881-1970), who set Georg Friedrich Daumer’s translation of Hafez, *Hafis: eine Sammlung persischer Gedichte* (Hamburg, 1846), to music. Regarding the compatibility of the *ghazals* with music, Lewis states that a “tactile sonority created by a thick texture and complex patterning of sounds complement th[e] thematic sensuality in the ghazals” (Lewis). Like Persian-speaking readers of Hafez, he recognizes onomatopoeic qualities in the verses such as those that imitate the sound of gurgling wine as it pours from a jug.

Hafez lived long enough to witness seven kings of three Persian dynasties, Injus (1325-1353), Muzaffarids (1353-1393) and Tamerlane (1384), and his poems reflect the social influence exerted by each. The influence of the lordship of the different rulers on the social circumstances, such as their hard policies on performing religious rituals and consequently closing the taverns, displays itself in his poems. Not all of the rulers were fond of Hafez and his poems and this disfavor perhaps caused him to be at times melancholic and elegiac.

### **2.1. The Complications of Hafez’s *Ghazals***

Qasim Ghani, with general support, puts Hafez among the six greatest Persian-speaking poets after the advent of Islam, behind Ferdawsi, Khayyam, Anvari, Mowlavi and Saadi. (I: 8)

Hafez also receives the sixth position on Goethe's list of seven great Persian poets which he introduces to his German readers in "Besserem Verständniss" (SWM 11.1.2, 157-62).

Bahaeddin Khorramshahi, a Persian Hafez scholar who spent forty years studying and editing six books in this field, describes Hafez's style as the most unique of all poets throughout the twelve-hundred year history of Persian poetry.<sup>5</sup> According to him, Hafez was an acquisitive and element-absorbing receiver of the *ghazals* written during the five hundred years before he lived, and an inspiring foundation for the poems that came after him. (*Hafez* 98) It is necessary to mention that in medieval Persian poetry there is an underlying connection between the styles of different poets, as evidenced in Hafez's poems, which carry elements of two of his predecessors, Mowlavi and Saadi, both well-known for their mystical and love *ghazals*. Hafez combines elemental fragments of these historical works--the mystical writings of Mowlavi and the love poems of Saadi--for innovative effects in his *ghazals*. (Khorramshahi, *Hafez* 98-9) Michael Hillmann, a contemporary Persianist, observes that Hafez's *ghazals* contain "the embodiment and integration of the skepticism and freethinking voiced in the quatrains attributed to Omar Khayyam, the inspiration and strength of spirit evident in the poetry of Rumi, and the aural and stylistic perfection of the poems of Sa'di [sic]"(2). Arberry agrees, arguing that despite the inspiration he drew from the poetic conventions of his countrymen, Hafez rejected the designation "mere imitator" by conveying his own style in his poetic lines. (*Classical Persian Literature* 351) Arberry characterizes three phases of Hafez's poetic development in this respect. Arberry suggests that in his youth the poet followed a monothematic principle, which insisted on non-philosophical utterances along subject lines such as earthly love and wine. At a later age, his style became more sophisticated by employing implications of Sufism and inclining

---

<sup>5</sup> Homayoun-Farrokh determines the history of Persian poetry to be eight thousand years by adding the era of Zoroastrianism. (43)



towards a “thematic-pattern” principle. In his late works, Arberry further observes, the poet tended toward “obscurity and allusiveness” in the thematic patterning of his verses. (*Fifty Poems of Hafiz* 29-32) As the scholarship on Hafez’s poems has shown, social circumstances of the life of the poet had a large influence on him, and the reader can see this in the uncertainty of meaning in his works. In part, this shows the political impact his court role had on his creative work, as this connection disallowed the writing of contrarian interests, particularly during the reign of tyrannous courts. The Hafez reader should, therefore, consider both the sociopolitical and literary customs of fourteenth-century Persia, customs which Hafez reflected for both personal and political reasons. The mandatory personal and political investment of a court poet in court ideology led Hafez, a follower of the free-thinking creed, to adopt contemporary poetical customs as a means to disguise in his works his deep frustration with the status quo.

As mentioned, Hafez never did collate his body of work, which has sparked disagreement on the exact number of poems he composed. Comparisons among sources show noticeable differences in the volume of work the writer produced, and because of this discrepancy, some scholars believe that a number of Hafez poems has been attributed to him mistakenly. Labeling this issue as one of the problems surrounding the “Hafizforschung”, Hans Robert Roemer, in his *Probleme der Hafizforschung und der Stand ihrer Lösung*, lists the disagreeing records in this respect: “Ein rein zahlenmäßiger Vergleich mag das Problem, um das es hier geht, veranschaulichen: während bei HALHALI 495 Ghasele zu finden sind, hat BROCKHAUS 692, der Druck von Calcutta 725 und eine wenig kritische Ausgabe von 1936 sogar 994 Gedichte” (6). Based on the results of this comparison, Roemer concludes that in the course of time the *Divan* has been expanded illegitimately by “zahlreiche Einschübe”(6)<sup>6</sup>.

---

<sup>6</sup> Arberry expresses the same opinion with respect to this issue in the introduction to his *Fifty Poems of Hafiz*. Figures reported by him for comparison read: “The Calcutta 1791 edition contains 725 poems; Brockhaus 692;

It is essential to discuss both the origin and form of the *ghazal*, the dominant form of Hafez's poems, to understand the context of the author's works. "Ghazal in Arabic means talking to women, philandering, narrating about youth, love making and praising women" (168), writes Tamimdari of the lyrical form, which is also similar to the western sonnet. (Arberry, *Fifty Poems* 1; Levy 33) The *ghazal* became a popular independent lyrical form including up to fifteen distiches during the twelfth century. (Meisami, *Court Poetry* 237-241)

Alessandro Bausani, a contemporary Italian orientalist, translated by Meisami in *Medieval Persian Poetry*, suggests "earlier Iranian folk poetry" (237)<sup>7</sup> to be the origin of the *ghazal* and laments the inconspicuousness of this fact. To Jan Rypka, the origin of the *ghazal* is similarly controversial, which leads him to arrive at three geneses, the *qasida*, "Iranian folk poetry", and the "pre-Islamic Persian form of song" (95). He believes that "*ghazal* springs from the cultural life of the town"<sup>8</sup>, while "*qasida* represents the poetry of the court" (95). Perhaps this is the reason why Tamimdari defines *qasida* as "something intended [...], which embodies a special meaning" (151). *Qasida* is a mono-rhymed lyric poem, which may run sometimes to over a hundred lines. (*Qasida*) The shared rhyme pattern (aa, ba, ca...) in the *ghazal* and *qasida* forms might be one of the reasons why they are said to share the same root. The rhyme pattern and *takhallos*, the mention of the poet's name in the *maqta'*<sup>9</sup>, are two of the outward characteristics of the *ghazal*. As the earlier-mentioned rhyme pattern indicates, the hemistiches of *matla'*<sup>10</sup> and

---

Pezhmān 994, many of them marked as doubtful or definitely spurious. The editors of MQ [Mirza Muhammad Qazvini] have admitted 495 *ghazals* as unquestionably genuine, beside 3 *qasīdas*, 2 *mathnavīs*, 34 occasional pieces (*muqaa'āt*) and 42 *rubā'īs*—a total of 573 poems" (11).

<sup>7</sup> The original source is in Italian.

<sup>8</sup> De Bruijn elaborates on this theme and introduces the triangle of "the Lover, the Beloved and Love" as the essential subject of the *ghazal* along with the constant background of nature. (65)

<sup>9</sup> *Maqta'* is the last or closing distich of the *ghazal*. It is called the "Couplet Royal" by Leaf and likened to the old French *envoi*. (Leaf 14)

<sup>10</sup> *Matla'* is the first or opening distich of the *ghazal*.

the rest of the second hemistiches of the poem have the same rhyme, which is often followed by the *radif*, the refrain.

Reuben Levy, in his book *An Introduction to Persian Literature*, points out the following themes employed in the *ghazal*: “The most normal theme was love, mystical or human, the homosexual being recognized; but anything might be touched on that stirred the emotions – the caprices of fortune’s whirligig, the mystery of life in the world, the upsurging happiness of springtime, or the joys and sorrows of friendship or other earthly attachments” (34). In this regard, other Hafez scholars such as Rypka, Shafiq Shamel and Arjomand-Fathi have recognized and categorized four major types of the *ghazal* in the *Divan*. As most other scholars, they agree on the existence of erotic, panegyric and mystical themes. Rypka and Shamel name the fourth type as meditative, whereas Arjomand-Fathi prefers not to label the group and instead provides an explanation of the genre. Naming this type of versification Hafez’s great and specialized achievement, she defines it as “Gedichte, die doppel- oder mehrdeutig sind, und auch jene Gedichte, die eine Mischung von zwei oder mehreren Bereichen enthalten”(85). As Arjomand-Fathi’s explanation suggests, this type of poem requires deeper consideration and meditation than Hafez’s other *ghazals*, which perhaps explains why the two former authors labeled this type of Hafez’s poems meditative. Doubtlessly, the complicated nature of Hafez’s *ghazals* has made it difficult for scholars to identify their themes and make further categorizations. The unique problem of unity in *ghazals* generally has also been a controversial topic since Hafez’s lifetime. A widely-quoted anecdote has circulated among scholars who have touched upon this issue throughout the centuries. It goes like this: Shah Shodja, Hafez’s king, *mamduh*<sup>11</sup> and patron for thirty-two years, himself a poet, criticized Hafez in person for his

---

<sup>11</sup> Rypka defines this term as “the Honoured One” when used in a *qasida*. The same term in the *ghazals*, he adds, means “Celebrated One” and refers to the “Beloved” (*ma’shuq*). (266)

*ghazals*' lack of inner unity. "On one occasion the Prince criticized Hafiz's verse on the ground of its many-sided aspects: no one motive, he complained, inspired it; it was at one moment mystical, at another erotic and bacchanalian; now serious and spiritual, and again flippant and worldly, or worse" (Browne III: 281). Michael Hillmann, in his *Unity in the Ghazals of Hafez*, conveys a common understanding of them. He also posits a multiplicity of themes in them and recognizes a lack of continuity among them, as each couplet carries a different theme.

It might be worthwhile mentioning the famous metaphor that associates the Hafezian *ghazal* and its distiches with a pearl necklace and its individual pearls. In this metaphor, the string of the necklace has been likened to the rhyme and metre of the *ghazal*, which is the only element holding the pearls (distiches) together. Rypka, a supporter of this metaphor, states: "Seeing that each distich is to a certain extent independent, the logical connection of the poem is not so clear and obvious as in European poetry, particularly in the *ghazal*, the unity of which is apparently or in fact only based on rhyme and metre" (91). Other scholars, conversely, seek to attribute a form of unity to the inward form of the *ghazal*. Hammer makes the readers of his Hafez translation aware of this "unerlässliches Gesetz des [Hafezschen] Gasels" and believes that the key to the unity of the *ghazals* lies in the content of the closing couplet, *maqta'* (I: XLI), or what Arberry refers to as "the final satisfying harmony's resolve" (*Fifty Poems* 30). Levy, unlike Hammer, sees more continuity in the distiches and suggests that the seemingly various contents of the distiches are in fact "variations on a theme" carrying "deep subtleties", and places the inability to follow such coherence on the shoulders of the "ordinary uninitiated hearer or reader" (35). As Rypka mentions, the different readings of a poetic work by western and eastern receivers must be taken into consideration in the examination of a poem by Hafez as much as any other author of international readership. In this respect, in the section "The Difficulties of

the Westerner in Comprehending Persian and Other Oriental Authors” of his volume *History of Iranian Literature*, Rypka recognizes the task of the western reader in perceiving the borders between the techniques of non-Western lyricists as a difficult one. (91) He illuminates his point further by stating that “the real difference [between oriental and occidental poetry] lies rather in the spontaneity of the West and its contrary in the Orient” (99), which places too much emphasis on “the expression of emotion” (100). He also touches briefly on the difficult task of an eastern poet in satisfying his reader through his “thought [, which] demands a formal completion in the manner of a rhetorical embellishment [...], in many cases a combination of several” (100), as opposed to the task of the occidental poet, who is able to move his reader by “a simple metaphor or a single simile”. (100)

Understanding the demanding imagination of his fastidious readers, Hafez knew well what a delicate task he confronted. Armed with the lavish literary devices of Persian poetry, he made good use of his literary heritage. Thus, one needs to familiarize oneself with the literary devices of Persian literature, and in particular with those cherished by Hafez, in order to discover the full meaning of his verses. A study of Hafez’s body of work shows the poet’s fondness for *ihaam*<sup>12</sup> (amphibology) in his style, although he also used other rhetorical devices such as *Mura’at-I nazir* (parallelism), *Tajnis* (play on words) and *Tashbib* (simile). (Arberry, *Fifty Poems* 18) The English translation of *ihaam* is indicative of the function of such a device: a distich containing *ihaam* engages the reader through multiple meanings of single words, which enrich and complicate the meaning of the total distich. Under these circumstances, the meanings are said to be both deep and superficial, which makes the reader uncertain about what is right. In most cases, the uninitiated reader applies the superficial meaning to the distich, which is contrary

---

<sup>12</sup> Rypka and Arberry translate *Iham* as “amphibology”, whereas Arjomand-Fathi chooses “ambiguity” and J. S. Meisami “allusion” as the right translations of the word.

to the poet's intention. It is obvious that Hafez's verses require the reader to be aware of their artifices, so that they perceive the deep and hidden meaning. *Ihaam* provides safe textual hiding places for a liberal-hearted poet like Hafez to conceal his real thoughts from the critics.

Christoph J. Bürgel, for instance, explains the sense of "ambiguity in the poetical universe of Hafiz" as follows:

[In Hafiz's poems], one verse contradicts the other, one interpretation is belied by another and this by a third one, all of which can point to a number of verses in their support. The longer we read Hafiz [sic] and the better we know him and the literary tradition on which he plays, the more we feel this ambiguity. We even arrive at the conclusion that perhaps this very ambiguity is his message. (35-36)

A cursory read through scholarly texts on the classical Persian poets shows that being a poet of classical times in Persia "was at the same time to be a scholar, in fact even more. The biographies of the poets state in each case that he was versed in 'all branches of learning', viz. theology, philosophy, jurisprudence, natural sciences--including astronomy and mathematics--medicine, in addition of course to the literary disciplines, viz. grammar, poetics, and rhetoric" (Rypka 101). Ingeborg Solbrig seems to have the same opinion as Rypka; to her "Ein persischer Dichter" in the era of Hafez was "ein Gelehrter" at the same time. (96) Having an understanding of scientific fields of his time, Hafez was able to refine his verses with his knowledge and at times give them a deeper dimension of ambivalence. With respect to *ihaam*, there are instances in which he used his scientific knowledge to convey a deeper meaning to supplement and make complex the preliminary, superficial one.<sup>13</sup>

---

<sup>13</sup> Having the same opinion, Arjomand-Fathi mentions *ghazal* no.10 of the letter "waw" (Hammer II: 327) as containing astronomical concepts. (92)

One further step to overcome the difficulties of Hafez's poems is to familiarize oneself with "[the] dramatis personae of the fictive world of the ghazals" (Meisami, *The Ghazal* 103). In this regard, the *Divan* resembles a drama revealing its one-dimensional and multi-dimensional protagonists and antagonists to his reader through the poems. To comprehend the one-dimensional characters, the reader must think beyond the usual connotative values of each of them. For instance, on the one hand, the term "rival" is the literal translation of *Raghib*, which is defined in Hafez's poems as protector. (Khorramshahi, *Hafezname* I: 335) The multi-dimensional personages, on the other hand, require a well-versed reader for recognition, who eventually becomes aware of the engaged connotations surrounding each character. Khorramshahi calls this attribute Hafez's first privilege and artistic value and relates it to the poet's mastery of mythologizing; his adeptness in creating motifs that are neither real, nor unreal, but surreal. Khorramshahi believes that myths possess reality's validity, and a great artist's distinction is to seize and coin this reality. (*Hafez* 25) Hafez surely succeeded in incorporating the existing societal values of his time and place into the spirit of the mythical characters of his *Divan*. Hafezian mythical motifs serve a dual purpose as "representation[s] of characters who function also as personifications of abstract concepts or values" existing in his society. (Meisami, *Medieval Persian Poetry* 136) Some of the multi-dimensional characters include: *Pire Moghan*<sup>14</sup> (a combination of the old wine seller and *Pire Tarighat*), *Deyre Moghan* (a combination of tavern and *Kharabat*<sup>15</sup>), Wine (with the combined faces of literal, mystical), *rend* (a combination of the Complete Man and a beggar<sup>16</sup>) and the characters *Shahed*, cup-bearer, *Zahed*<sup>17</sup>, Sufi,

---

<sup>14</sup> Zoroastrian Magian wine seller, who symbolized Zoroastrianism. (Caton 42-43)

<sup>15</sup> "*Kharabat* in Hafez's poems means the place of ruins, also the place where wine was served, in the Jewish or Zoroastrian quarters, which was in the worst part of town. In mysticism, it is the school where you learn" (Caton 28).

<sup>16</sup> Beggar is one of the characters itself.

<sup>17</sup> "Zealot" and "Ascetic". (Caton 41)

monastery, mosque and *Kharabat*, who function mostly as one-dimensional figures. To Khorramshahi, even the cup of wine and the goblet have mythological dimensions. (*Hafezname* I: 25) Thus, Hafez allows his audience to see the characters reveal their true selves through the drama of the *Divan*.

Hafez writes himself as a member of his imagined society, and takes the role of *rend*<sup>18</sup>, the liberal-minded freethinker. He shows his hatred of *Zahed* and portrays his affection for his physical and spiritual beloved. *Zahed* embodies the sanctimonious hypocrite, who upbraids Hafez, a *rend*, for his pagan belief. Hafez's role as *rend* is indicative of two things: through the role of a freethinker, Hafez highlights his unaligned function in portraying the real situation of society and leaves it up to his audience to distinguish between good and evil. Hafez's *rend*, furthermore, is someone who does not involve himself in extremes, and believes in enjoying every minute of life through the blessings of love and wine. Hafez, a *rend* who "differ[ed] from the norm [,]... h[e]ld a minority opinion [and was] not free to express [his thoughts] directly" (Caton 35), was obviously obliged to use the technique of "pseudonymity [and] anonymity"<sup>19</sup> to show the societal conditions to his audience, at the same time placing his frustration with the strictly orthodox countrymen of his society further beyond the reach of their hypercriticism. He hated and was hated by the hypocrites, who criticized others for sinful deeds without paying attention to their false and deceptive deeds. Two solutions are deemed by Arberry as means conveyed in the poems for dealing with this situation. "One, as symbolized by Wine (and sometimes love) is the path of unreason" (*Classical Persian Literature* 360), which one should

---

<sup>18</sup> Caton mentions Robin Hood as the Western counterpart for the Hafezian *Rend* and describes him as a "freethinking responsible free-spirit, who had no respect for established rituals." (34)

<sup>19</sup> Meisami mentions this as the "characteristic feature of medieval literature, where the writer's purpose in introducing characters is not 'to make them behave like 'real people': everything they do is related to a problem and its elaboration within the work,' and in keeping with this principle, the author depicts only those traits relevant to the problem(s) treated. Within these limitations, however, the character depicted may be of considerable complexity" (Meisami, *Medieval Persian Poetry* 136).



follow to enjoy earthly bliss. Varzi elaborates on this theme from a Sufical point of view, arguing that “Drinking with the intent of knowing the reality for Hafez is opening a channel through which [one] may draw closer to reality, it opens [one’s] eyes to unseen mysteries”(Caton 40). Arberry believes the other solution suggested by the poet to be “the path of Pure Reason,” (*Classical Persian Literature* 360), by which one should seek for the real truth and thus unmask and know the true nature of the *Zahed*. Hafez succeeds in disguising his thoughts and, therefore, perpetuates them through the passing of time until they are discovered by his future readers.

One of the other tools that was used by fourteenth-century Persian poets to embellish and elaborate their works was to incorporate Sufical terms, and Hafez’s work is no exception. This quality of the *ghazals* functions as a further obstacle in understanding them and makes their interpretation a matter of debate.

## **2.2. Mystical vs. Secular Implications of the *Ghazals***

As mentioned, some of Hafez’s poems can be interpreted in a purely mystical sense, while others require no understanding of mysticism. A look at studies on Hafez since the very first translation of some of his *ghazals* into Latin by Thomas Hyde (1636-1703) in the late seventeenth century shows that the West has generally preferred to ignore the mystical aspect of the *ghazals*, whereas the East has tended to explore and enjoy aspects of mysticism in them.

Since Sufism is the mystical focus of Islam, the subject matter of mystical implications of the *ghazals* has brought up the subject of whether their composer belonged to a Sufi order or not. Hafez’s doctrine as a freethinker has given cause for debate on his religion. Some scholars believe that Hafez longed for his ancestral Zoroastrian religion before the advent of Islam (Caton 42-43). One of the famous anecdotes about this matter dates back to Ottoman Turkish literature

of the seventeenth century, which resulted in the emergence of the three well-known Turkish translations and commentaries on his *Divan*. The famous Turkish mufti Abu Suud (d. 1578) was called upon to pronounce a fatwa, a religious decree, on Hafez's attitude. Abu Suud's vague answer put the responsibility of the interpretation of Hafez's *ghazals* on the reader, causing the three important Turkish commentaries by Sudi, Sururi and Shammi<sup>20</sup> to emerge. The former focused on the physical or grammatical nature of the poems and the latter two on their spiritual essence (Dynes and Donaldson 264). The confusion surrounding Hafez's burial illustrates the controversy about his religion. Religious fanatics who opposed Hafez's poetry during his lifetime refused to allow him to have a ritualistic burial. The situation created an atmosphere of disagreement and conflict among the poet's supporters. Therefore, supporters and opponents agreed to use Hafez's own words by drawing one couplet from the *Divan* and following the content to resolve the controversy. By virtue of that couplet verse, Hafez earned burial with the full ritual of a Persian funeral. Hammer translates it for his readers as follows:

Wende die Schritte nicht ab  
 Vom Grab'Hafisens,  
 Wenn gleich in Sünden verstrickt  
 Harrt er des Himmels. (I: XXXII)

Hammer clearly understood Hafez as a Sufi and calls him so in the foreword to his Hafez translation: "Man weiß nicht, daß er sich zu einer Lehre irgend eines Scheichs bekannt habe, doch ist man darüber einig, daß er unter die Sofis gehöre, und seine eigenen Verse dienen hiezu zum Belege" (I: XIII). Other Hafez scholars, such as Hans Robert Roemer, refuse to call Hafez a Sufi by not interpreting the content of his poems from a mystical perspective in the first place, and regard his style as the "Zugeständnisse an den literarischen Geschmack der Zeit" (20).

---

<sup>20</sup> There is controversy about the exact names and dates of these three Turkish commentators.

Khorramshahi scrutinizes the subject further by differentiating between practical Sufism and theoretical mysticism. To this end, he uses the poet's own verses to establish evidence in determining the matter. From his point of view, Sufi and the literal translation of the Persian "Old" are representatives of Sufism, and the meaning of the words "robe" and "monastery" in its proximity are indications of it. Having discussed the content of a distich containing these words, Khorramshahi concludes that Hafez avoids representations of Sufism and seeks refuge in *Kharabat* or the "tavern" of theoretical or unofficial mysticism. Khorramshahi mentions *rend* and *Pire Moghan* as the representatives of mysticism and uses six couplets of the *Divan* to support his argument. (*Hafez* 175-80) One of them, in Hammer's translation, reads:

Geh' zur Schenk' und röthe dein Angesicht dorten,

Geh' nicht in die Zelle, dort wohnen die Gleißner. (App. 97 "Herrscher", 12-13)

The well-known Persian biographical dictionary of Sufis, *Nafahat al-Uns (Zephyrs of Tranquility)* by Jami, recognizes Hafez as a non-Sufi. Having a strong mystical strain and a Sufi connection himself, the fifteenth-century Persian Sufi poet is uncertain whether Hafez belonged to a Sufical order, while identifying Hafez's predecessor, Saadi, as a distinguished Sufi. Whatever the case, it would be right to agree with Roemer and take Hafez's mystical readings as the fashion of poetical literature during his time, which confirms the existence of mystical implications in the *ghazals* and invalidates the arguments of those who would claim Hafez's total ignorance of them. J.T.P. de Bruijn, in his *Persian Sufi Poetry*, verifies Hafez's writings as the most typical example of the controversy surrounding mystical or non-mystical interpretations of the lyrical genre *ghazal* and sees the reason for this controversy in the deep influence of Sufi poetry on its adopted form, the *ghazal*.(3-4) Lending Sufical flavor to his poems served two obvious functions for Hafez in the *ghazals*: it added more complication to their poly-functional

dimension, which helps them escape charges of so-called impiety and transgression, and it led them to enhance their multi-layered texture, which satisfies the demanding minds of their readers.

### **2.3. Translatability of Hafez**

One vital factor for the success of any translation process is clearly the flexibility of the target language. Otherwise stated, the process of translation does not fail until it faces a lack of parallelism of function between the two languages involved. The blame for this lack may be put on the limits caused by either the source language or the target language. Nevertheless, it is the source language that is the commander and its linguistic principles the rules; the target language, conversely, is resigned to follow the rules of this one-way interaction. Based on comparative studies, the lack of parallelism between Persian and either English or German in the case of Hafez is rooted to a great extent in the linguistic individuality of the source language. Therefore, the first step in trying to unravel the complications of Hafez's *ghazals* is to take into consideration the syntactical differences between the Persian language and the target language on the whole. In this regard, Arjomand-Fathi gives her reader a thorough list of the linguistic peculiarities of the Persian language which cause difficulties for German translators despite a certain affinity based on their mutual Indo-German origin. (71) I elaborate now on Arjomand-Fathi's list of inconsistencies with regard to the German language as they will be of further assistance in the investigation that follows in the next chapter:

1. There are 32 letters in Persian, a few of which do not have equivalents in German. This disharmony, Arjomand-Fathi believes, damages the rhythm and musicality of nouns to be transcribed and translated. (71)

2. In Persian there is just one pronoun “U”<sup>21</sup> for the German “er”, “sie” and “es”, which entirely removes from German the “flexibility” and “ambiguousness” that “U” provides for the person to which it refers. (Arjomand-Fathi 72)

3. The non-gendered nature of Persian allows for further ambiguity, which is eliminated by the gender-specificity of German. (Arjomand-Fathi 72)

4. Most Persian nouns have more than one meaning while retaining their pronunciation and spelling. The manifold interpretative possibilities of such homonyms can hardly be reflected in other languages. Arjomand-Fathi’s example elucidates the problem. The Persian word “*mah*” means “moon”, “month”, “beautiful” and “pretty beloved” always with the same spelling and pronunciation. (73) As we have discussed, the same problem exists in the distiches of the *ghazals*, which creates an immense obstacle for a translator whose language does not support transferring such poly-functionality. Hafez’s word selection has the intention of engaging the reader by providing more than one meaning, a quality that is much less strongly represented in the western languages.

5. The vowels of Persian words are not written. Arjomand-Fathi gives the case of “k + h” as an example, whose different pronunciations provide multiple meanings: “*keh*” means spontaneously “that”, “who”, “short or small”, “*koh*” refers to “mountain” and “straw” is the literal translation of “*kah*”. (73-74)

6. Arjomand-Fathi combines the last linguistic problem with Hafez’s mastery of rhythm and music. (88) As we have already touched upon, this skill has been related to Hafez’s knowledge of music and singing. Leaf reckons any “imitation” of “the modulations of a language naturally most musical” to be “some distant echo of the lilt of his metres” and thus “a hopeless task” (7) for the translator. As for the prosody, difficulties are posed by the repetitive mono-rhymes of the

---

<sup>21</sup> This word is pronounced the same as the German pronunciation of the letter “u”.

*ghazal* since the meaning of each rhyming word of a distich along with its rhyming letters severely restricts the translator in choosing words that have the same rhyming letters and provide the same meanings as the original.

In sum, the peculiarities of Persian provide Persian-speaking authors of prose or poetry with many tools with which to embellish their texts with ambiguity. Having examined the tools, one can easily sense the superficiality of a rendering of Hafez devoid of these devices when compared to the original, an actuality that perhaps obliged Ali Dashti to say “translated Hafez [is] not the Persian Hafez” (309). Thus, any westernized version of Hafez might only be considered as a “true imitation, [...] which can be read and admired independently of its ‘original’, but which also communicates a sense of that original’s spirit and power”<sup>22</sup> (Loloi 69). With this in mind we are now prepared to assess in the following chapter the success of Hammer’s attempt.

---

<sup>22</sup> Loloi discusses three types of Hafez translations in light of Dryden, who categorizes Hafez’s translations into English as “metaphrase”, “paraphrase” and “imitation”. In imitating, Dryden explains, “the translator (if now he has not lost that name) assumes the liberty not only to vary from the words and sense, but to forsake them both as he sees occasion; and taking only some general hints from the original, to run division on the groundwork, as he pleases” (151).

### 3. Joseph Freiherr von Hammer Purgstall's Hafez Translation and its Reception

Hafez's *ghazals* began to travel beyond the borders of their creator's homeland via European travelers about three hundred years after his death. They were transcribed into Roman characters and translated into Latin by the Bodleian librarian Thomas Hyde (1636-1703) in Oxford at a date approximated at 1690<sup>23</sup>. (Arberry 333) Hans Robert Roemer attributes the first translation of an Hafezian *ghazal* to a person named Meninski in 1677 in Vienna [Eusebius (1550) or Franz (1680)], making Hyde's later translation the second attempt. (4) Tracing the footsteps of these two pioneers of Hafez translation working at the end of the seventeenth century, other European translators put pen to Hafez's *ghazals* in French, English and German<sup>24</sup> in the centuries to come.

Notwithstanding the sporadic translations of the *ghazals* by the turn of the eighteenth century, the most significant translation was completed by the Graz-born orientalist and diplomat Joseph Freiherr von Hammer Purgstall. His translation into German introduced Hafez's complete *Divan* to world literature and triggered a noticeable number of renderings after its publication.<sup>25</sup> Hammer's translation fuelled German interest in 'oriental' literature and triggered the Eastern Movement or "Orientalism" during the second half of the nineteenth century (Iqbal 51), resulting in the emergence of two additional complete three-volume translations by the German translator Hermann Brockhaus (1854-60), and the Viennese translator Vincenz von Rosenzweig (1858-64). Both of these emerged about a half century after the publication of Hammer's version. Other significant German renderings on the list of Hafez translations include

---

<sup>23</sup> A manuscript of some of Hafez's *ghazals* written during the final days of the poet's life was discovered at this library in the summer of 2006 by Ali Ferdusi. It is possible that Hyde had access to this source.

<sup>24</sup> Quoting from the French source *Notices et Extraits* Roemer introduces Wahl's attempt in 1791 as the first German translation. (4)

<sup>25</sup> Goethe introduced the phrase "Weltliteratur" to the literary world with the purpose of expanding the corpus of 'national literature'. In his *Gespräche mit Goethe*, Johann Peter Eckermann (1792-1854), Goethe's editor recorded Goethe's notion of "Weltliteratur", which invites everyone to familiarize themselves with the literary works of foreign nations (31.1.1827:198).

those by August von Platen (1853), Friedrich Rückert (1877), George Friedrich Daumer (1846) and Friedrich Bodenstedt (1877).<sup>26</sup> Hammer's noteworthy accomplishment in translating Hafez was praised by Goethe, who owed his acquaintance with Hafez and subsequently the emergence of his *West-östlicher Divan* to Hammer's translation, which was passed on to him via his publisher, Cotta. (Otto and Witte 308) The section "Von Hammer" in his "Noten und Abhandlungen zum Besseren Verständnis" to the *Divan* is evidence of debt to the translator:

Wie viel ich diesem würdigen Mann schuldig geworden, beweist mein Büchlein in allen seinen Theilen. Längst war ich auf Hafis und dessen Gedichte aufmerksam, aber was mir auch Literatur, Reisebeschreibung, Zeitblatt und sonst zu Gesicht brachte, gab mir keinen Begriff, keine Anschauung von dem Werth, von dem Verdienste dieses außerordentlichen Mannes. (Goethe, SWM 11.1.2, 260-61)

In addition to his Hafez translation, Hammer continued to acquaint the German-speaking world with eastern literature and poetry through further contributions to this field in the early eighteenth century. During the course of his studies, Hammer founded and published eight volumes of the first European oriental periodical, *Fundgruben des Orients*, the first four volumes of which were read enthusiastically by Goethe. (Otto and Witte 309) Although Hammer's main interest lay in Ottoman literature, his *Geschichte der Schönen Redekünste Persiens* (1818), in which he reviewed the work of two hundred Persian poets, is regarded as a valuable source for Persian literary history. (Reichl 183) This book reportedly served as a literary stimulus for the prose section of the *West-östlicher Divan* and helped Goethe to complete his *Divan* by supplementing it with the "Noten und Abhandlungen zum Besserem Verständnis". (Otto and Witte 323)

---

<sup>26</sup> Among the Hafez translations of the nineteenth century into English, Gertrude Bell's *Poems from the Divan of Hafiz* (1897) is recognized as the "most successful interpretation". (Arberry 342)



Hammer resided twice in Constantinople between 1799 and 1806 as a diplomat (Hammer I: II), when several failed schedules left his wish to visit Persia unfulfilled. (Reichl 185) A short survey of the literary development of Constantinople and its subsequent influential impact on Hammer reveals his inspiration for embarking upon translating Hafez's complete *Divan*.

Persian literature, in particular poetry, had considerable influence on the elite Ottoman poets of today's Turkey from the middle of the fifteenth to the middle of the nineteenth century, such that their works were imitative of Persian classics. This period covers a major part of the Old or Asiatic School of Ottoman poetry, wherein Persian influence reached and maintained its highest level of prestige, as Elias John Wilkinson Gibb (1857-1901), the British orientalist, reports in the first volume of six in his book on the history of Ottoman poetry. Gibb refers to the impact of Persian poetry on Ottoman poetry during this time as the "Persianisation" of the latter, wherein the contemporary Persian School served as an influential model. A fight against "Persianism", which was at first unsuccessful, gave rise to the New or European School of Ottoman literature in the middle of the nineteenth century. Gibb defines "Persianism [as a] culture [...] adopted by Ottomans, and more especially, [...] applied by them to matters connected with literature" (1: 4-5). With regard to Ottoman poetry's "Persianisation", he explains: "The Turks knew but one literature, that of Persia on which they had been reared. And thus this brilliant literature became, not by selection, but by force of circumstances, the model after which the Turks should fashion [w]hat they were about to found" (1: 12). Therefore, reflection on works by classical Persian poets by means of writing commentaries and imitations during the time of the Old School became the fashion among Ottomanians and other peoples under the power of the Ottoman Empire. The text from which Hammer translated Hafez's *Divan* was also an Ottoman Turkish edition, commented on by the Bosnian philologist (Ahmed) Sudi

Efendi (Bosniak)<sup>27</sup> (d. 1595-99), which was produced during the so-called “Persianisation” of Ottoman poetry in the seventeenth century. In the foreword to his book, Hammer calls Sudi’s commentary the “vorzüglichste” (I: IV) compared to the other two by Schemii and Sururi (d. 1561) he had read. Sudi translated Hafez’s verses word-for-word from Persian to Turkish and scrutinized the meaning and context of every single word thoroughly. Particularity and precision make his book the best philological and syntactical approach to Hafez’s poems even today. Yet, the implications that this mode of reading might have had for the semantics of the translation must be considered. Edward Brown, in his *Literary History of Persia*, underlines the semantic inadequacy of this translation by describing Sudi’s approach as one which “avoids all attempts at allegorical interpretation and the search for the ‘inner meaning’”, while “very wisely confin[ed] to the elucidation of the literal meaning” (III: 299). Arjomand-Fathi also believes that Sudi incorporated his own interpretation during his rendition of Hafez’s works. (69) Based on this evidence, I will examine both Hammer’s and Sudi’s translations in an effort to determine the influence of both authors’ approaches and biases<sup>28</sup>.

Using Sudi’s Turkish edition, Hammer began his translation in 1799 in Constantinople and finished during his second stay in 1806. He spent three years refining the renderings and enriching the footnotes, and the production of his ten-year effort was published in two volumes after three years in 1812 and 1813 by the distinguished Cotta publishing house in Stuttgart. (Hammer I: III-IV) Hammer recounts the number and genres of the poems in Hafez’s *Divan* in his foreword to the translation. As reported by him, his volumes embrace “576 *Gasel* – oder Oden, sechs *Mesneviat* oder Vers für Vers gereimte länger[e] Gedichte, zwey *Kaßide*, gewöhnlich für Elegien genommen, 44 *Mokataat* oder Bruchstücke, 72 *Rubajat* oder vierzeilige

<sup>27</sup> There is controversy about the exact name and date of the Turkish commentator of Hafez.

<sup>28</sup> I do not read Turkish; therefore, I used the well known Persian translation by Esmat Sattarzade to examine Sudi’s translation and commentary.

Strophen, und ein *Tachmis*, d.i. ein Gedicht von fünfzeiligen Strophen” (I: II-III). Like Gholandam, the first compiler of Hafez’s poems, Hammer divided the *ghazals* by grouping them according to the final letter of their rhyming words in order of the Persian alphabet and used the transcription of the final letter as the name of the group. For instance, he categorized ninety *ghazals* ending in the literally-transcribed Persian letter *Dal* in the group *Dal*. He also used the transcription of the first hemistich of each poem as the poem’s title, which some scholars believe was intended to facilitate access to Persian readers for later comparisons. (Mina 20) In the three separate forewords to his translation, Hammer identified his first goal as familiarizing his readers with the Persian poet and the nature of his poems by associating them with recognized Latin and Greek paradigms, calling Hafez a lyrical sibling of Horace. (I: I) He summarized the message of Hafez’s poems and linked his genius of oriental fantasy to familiar examples. He then led his readers as a friendly outsider through the poems of the *Divan* via the medium of his renderings. (Hammer I: XXXVI-XLII) He guided his readers with the assurance of providing them, he wrote, with the “möglichste Treue nicht nur in Wendung und Bild, sondern auch in Rhythmus und Strophenbau” (Hammer I: VI). Yet, as we have seen, most critics disagreed with him on this point as time passed, and even those favourably disposed to his renditions were aware that the complexity of translating Persian poetry, as I described in the previous chapter, made precision impossible. So they have praised him in different terms, as a great contributor to world literature. This positive group also rejects an evaluation of Hammer’s translation through the contemporary perspective and believes that its just reception is possible only through the lens of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. (Tafazoli) They also point to a lack of ‘systematic translation criticism’ of Hammer’s Hafez-translation and believe the cause of the faulty

judgments on Hammer's work lies in the fact that Goethe philologists are not orientalists, nor have Iranian scholars shown interest in analyzing Hammer's work. (Mina V)

### 3.1. An Assessment of Hammer's Translation in Light of Goethe's Poems

As mentioned in the previous chapter, Hafez's poems revolve around three main thematic elements, which Goethe calls "Elemente ein[es] ächte[n] Lied[es]" in his poem "Elemente" of the "Buch des Sängers" (App. 109, 2). These are, in Goethe's eyes, "Liebe", "Rubin des Weins", and "[des] Dichter[s] [Hass von] Unleidlich[em]," the last referring to the poet's hatred of the dogmas of orthodox clergy. Goethe went on to write that poems containing these elements would "die Völker ewig freuen und erfrischen" (App. 109, 23-4). Hammer too summarized these Hafezian elements in the foreword to his translation. His explanation there underlines Hafez's hedonism and life-affirming attitude celebrating the material pleasures in opposition to the sermon from the pulpit:

"[E]r trinkt Licht und Weisheit aus dem [sic] Quelle des ewigen Lebens, das ist, aus dem [sic] Quelle der ewigen Liebe. ... Oft so ernst wie diese hochfliegende Sprache der *Sofis* und begeisterter *Scheiche*, aber oft gerade das Gegentheil, scheint Hafis dieser Lehren zu spotten, ... Dann verlacht er die Heuchelei der *Derwische* und *Kalender*, preiset die Schenken und Häuser wüster Lust, sieht in den Sagen von Eden und dem ewigen Leben nichts als Bilder der Schönheit des Liebchens und der Freuden des Lebens, ruft Schenken und Sänger auf, und legt in den Mund der Rosen und Nachtigallen die Lehre" (I: XXXIX-XL).

Taking Hafez's bacchanalian approach toward figures of religious authority at face value, Hammer magnifies the *Divan's* libertine aspect by devaluing other aspects of the poems, such as

their mystical implications. Based on the dramatis personae of Hafez's *Divan*, as presented in the first chapter, I have selected two complete poems and a number of single distiches containing Hafezian characters to demonstrate this point. Verses from Goethe's *West-östlicher Divan* with similar contents are then examined in order to determine the extent to which Hafez's message came through.

### **3.1.1. The Pivotal Function of Hafez's *Rend*: His Rejection of Hypocrisy**

*Rend*, Hafez's impersonator in the *Divan*, plays a pivotal role in the activity and development of other poetical creatures of his universe. The figure functions as an antithesis to hypocrites named throughout as *Sufi*, *Darwisch* or *Zahed* [zealot], whose approach Hafez considers to be ascetic. By acting as an advocate for love, wine and other elements forbidden by the ascetics, Hafez's *rend* communicates the author's strong opposition to them. Therefore, as Hafez's spokesman, he condemns their strict dogmas and shows his own intense yearning for his Zoroastrian ancestors. He longs for them as his "geistige Vorbilder" (Mina 11), whose "appreciation of reason, life and happiness rejects blind faith and [a] slavish approach towards any authority [that] make[s] ... a world ... tolerate deceit, violence and cruelty" (Sakhai). In the section "Perser", Goethe recognizes Zoroastrianism as "[eine] edle, reine Naturreligion" (SWM 11.1.2, 140) and elucidates the rituals and teachings of this Persian ancient creed, which he further examines from an historical perspective in the poem "Vermächtniß des alten Parsen" in the "Buch des Parsen". (142)

In *ghazal* eighty-six of the group *Ta*, Hafez as writer-emancipator rejects the tenets of his clerical society. This *ghazal* is one of few that he versified on the occasion of the end of

*Ramadan*<sup>29</sup>, a time of celebration when taverns reopened and drinking wine was again allowed. Furthermore, it is one of very few *ghazals* in which the repetition of the word *rend* throughout the poem indicates the focal role of this figure for the overall message. Hammer's translation of the poem has eight distichs.<sup>30</sup> Here is the first:

Die [sic] Fasten ist vorbei! das Fest ist da, auf sind die Herzen,

Im Fasse gährt der Wein, nun ist es Zeit zu fodern. (App. 94, 1-2)

Hammer divides a distich into four hemistichs in his translation of the majority of *ghazals*. In this poem his translation succeeds in achieving the metrics of the original by rendering the distichs in two hemistichs. His attempt to maintain the fundamental metric rule of the *ghazal*, the rhyming pattern “-en” of the first hemistich fails, as it is not sustained throughout the poem. Semantically, the first hemistich of the translation transfers the meaning despite the fact that Hammer pluralizes “Fasten” in his rendering. This can be considered the result of Sudi’s interpretation of the distich, in which he uses “*Ramadan days*” instead of the original singular noun for “fasting”. In the second hemistich, however, there are semantic deviations from the original which are not the result of Sudi’s commentary. The first clause of this hemistich in the original talks about the tavern, in which wine “aufwallt”. The choice of the verb “aufwallen” works well in this clause, since it recalls the thematics of the last clause of the previous hemistich: in the reader’s eyes the “aufwallen” of wine in the tavern enlivens “das Auffallen von der Freude in den Herzen”. Hammer omits three literally-translated “and”s in the first hemistich and one in the second to avoid repetitive hiatuses. Unlike the translation, the repetitive uses of “and”, *wa*, in the original, connect the words phonologically together like the links of a chain, since they become the vowel “o” and can be combined to their preceding word as in *shod-o*

---

<sup>29</sup> *Ramadan* is the ninth month of the Muslim year, during which Muslims must fast from sunrise to sunset.

<sup>30</sup> The fifth distich of Sudi’s edition of the poem, wherein *rend* occurs for the third time, is eliminated by Hammer for some reason which is now difficult to determine.

[became and]. In order to fill the second hemistich, Hammer chooses to add “nun ist es Zeit” to its second clause. For comparison and contrast, Bürgel’s more sophisticated translation of the same distich reads: “Das Fasten entwich; das Fest kam und die Herzen *erstanden!*/Der Wein im Fässerhaus kam in Wallung, und Wein muß man (jetzt) *bestellen!*” (App. 102 “Das Fasten”, 1-2).

One significant aspect of the original that does not reach Hafez’s foreign reader is the melody of the distichs, which Hafez creates by employing phonetic patterning such as consonance and assonance. Hafez, well-known as a master of rhythm, creates this musicality through word play, a quality that was lost in both of the translations. The musicality of this distich lies mostly in the use of consonance, i.e. the repetition of the consonant *d* (*dal*) in the first hemistich and consonant *m* (*mim*) in the second hemistich (examples highlighted):

*Rooze yeksoo shod-o eyd amad-o delha barkhast*

*Mey ze meykhane be joosh amad-o mi bayad khast*

As was the custom among pre-modern Persian poets, Hafez was fond of creating a melody as part of the metrical structure of his distichs. This he achieved further by splitting up his hemistichs into shorter metrical units, mostly into rhyming halves. In the first hemistich above, *Rooze yeksoo shod-o*, the rhyming pattern of *amad* [came] creates a melody in its second emergence in the second hemistich. The two different possible pronunciations of the transliterated word *mi* in the second hemistich have an influence on the meaning of the word. It can be pronounced *mey* [wine], which would create the device of repetition with its other two occurrences. It can also be pronounced *mi*, which then should be considered in the combination with *bayad*, both of which mean together “müssen”. Sudi explains and validates both interpretations, but neither is reflected in Hammer’s translation.

The next distich reads:

Vorbei ist jetzt die Zeit, der schweren Tugendprahler,

Die Zeit der Wonn' und Lust, für Trunk'ne ist gekommen, (94, 3-4)

Hammer uses “vorbei” to translate two different verbs in this line and in the previous distich. Despite the semantic accuracy of these hemistichs, the translations do not preserve the original atmospheric effects. One of the reasons for this is that Hammer replaces *rend* with “Truk’ne” in the second hemistich, which prevents other aspects of this character from emerging to confront its counterpart, “Tugendprahler”, *zohd forooshan*, in the second hemistich. As a result, the rhetorical device of contrast is lost in the translation. The employment of “schwere Tugendprahler” seems to be somewhat flexible. The selection of “schwer” shows the influence of Sudi, who suggests the literal translation “heavy life” for this attributive phrase. *Shadi* and *Tarab* in the original both refer to “Lust” and “Fröhlichkeit”, which are embodied in the meaning of “Wonne” used by Hammer. A synonym is used in the first original mention of the word “Zeit” and Hammer’s choice of “jetzt” is not mentioned in the original. Hafez’s word choice of four words ending in *-aan* creates an internal rhyme which reflects a songlike form that is not reflected in the translation. Moreover, the consonance of *n* (*nun*) in the first and second hemistichs and the consonance of *r* (*re*) in the second hemistichs are lost in the translation.

The next distich reads:

Verdient der wohl Schimpf, der fröhlich, wie ich, trinket,

Dies ist nicht schändlich, ist nicht dumm und schmähhch. (94, 5-6)

In this distich, Hammer breaks his hemistichs into rhyming halves, thereby establishing an internal rhyme with “-ich” twice in both the first and second hemistichs between “fröhlich”, “ich”, “schändlich” and “schmähhch”. The sound of these words including the repetition of “nicht” creates consonance (examples highlighted above). Yet, this prosodic sonority lessens the



quality of the semantics of the original. To create this effect, Hammer first adds the term “fröhlich” to the original text. Moreover, he replaces the original “wir” with “ich”. Hafez’s tendency to pluralize his speaker is one of the ways through which he adds ambiguity to his expressions. In this distich, Hammer, once more, neglects Hafez’s protagonist, *rend*, by not providing a translation for or reference to him. By contrast, Sudi provides a sufficient summary of the context of the distich in his comments, wherein he mentions the term *rend* twice. A literal translation of his interpretation reads: “He receives so much ‘Tadel’, who drinks wine like us. This among lovers and *rends* is neither a blemish nor a fault, namely wine-drinking among lovers and *rends* is not considered a fault, even if it is considered so among zealots and worshippers” (Sudi I: 172; translation mine). Hammer reestablishes the repetition of *na* [nicht] in his rendering despite omitting the “*rend* lover” and adding “dumm”. The choice of the words “Schimpf” and “dumm und schmähhlich” seems to be somewhat flexible. Instead of “Schimpf,” “Tadel” and instead of “dumm und schmähhlich,” the single word “Irrtum” would well connote the original. Hammer’s attempt seems alliterative, both with respect to these word choices and to “schändlich”. It should be mentioned that Hafez uses different words equivalent to wine and wine-drinking in his poems. In this poem, for instance, depending on the rhythm of the hemistich, he plays with three different forms of wine: *mey* [wine], *baadeh* [wine] and *khoone razan* [blood of grapes]. His selection of *baadeh* in the first hemistich of this distich creates the sound patterning of -aa- or the long vowel *a*, which is repeated by three other words in this hemistich (examples highlighted): *che malaamat resad aanraa ke cho maa baadeh khorad*. Khorramshahi, whose two-volume commentary covers two hundred *ghazals*, lists about thirty-five words, phrases, metaphors, verbs, and adjectives which refer to wine in the Hafez corpus. (*Hafezname* I: 17 ; II: 1311)

The next distich reads:

Ein Trunkner ohne Falsch und ohne Gleisnerei,

Ist besser als ein Schalk, in Kloster und in Zellen. (94, 7-8)

In this distich Hafez confronts his antagonist, the “piety-seller”, again with his protagonist *rend*, although he does not mention the latter directly. A prose translation of Hafez’s line reads: “a wine drinker, in whom there is no face and hypocrisy, better than a piety-seller, in whom there is face and hypocrisy” (Hafez 25; translation mine). As this literal translation shows, the second clause is repeated exactly in the second hemistich of the line in the original, which is an example of the rhetorical device of repetition. The lengthy employment of this device contributes greatly to the semantic as well as the metrical quality of the original, which is omitted by Hammer’s free translation.

The next distich reads:

Was recht ist wollen wir, und Niemand Böses thun,

Vom Uebrigen sey unser Spruch: Es ist erlaubt. (94, 9-10)

This rendering shows a free reproduction by Hammer, uninfluenced by Sudi’s commentary. In fact, the clause “und Niemand Böses thun” is the only part of the translation that corresponds with the original. A literal translation of this distich displays a noticeable deviation from the original: “we do God’s command and don’t do anyone ill / and what they say is not allowed, we don’t say is allowed” (Sudi I: 172; translation mine). By using “Es ist erlaubt” Hammer preserves the deeper meaning while altering the surface meaning. Bürgel’s verbatim rendering in comparison reads: “Die göttlichen Gebote wollen wir (in Kraft) lassen und niemand Böses tun; / Und das, was, wie sie sagen, unstatthaft ist, (von dem) sagen wir nicht, es sei *statthaft!*” (App. 102 “Das Fasten”, 11-12). Hammer’s semantic deviation from the original did not create

the acoustic quality crafted in the original, however. Hafez created an internal rhyme between the rhyming halves of both of the lines, enhancing their prosodic quality further through the use of consonance (examples highlighted): *farze i'ad bogzaarim-o be kas bad nakonim / v-anche gooyand ravaa nist nagoo-im ravaast*. In the second hemistich, he also uses the phono-semantic play of *eshteghag*, paronomasia, between the third-person plural and first-person plural of the verb *goftan* [to say].

The next distich reads:

Der Wein kommt von dem Blut der Rebe, nicht von Eurem.

Was soll's, wenn werden wir, der Gläser ein'ge leeren? (94, 11-12)

In translating this distich, Hammer replaces the first hemistich with the second, while retaining the overall semantic structure of the line. To allow for the rhythmical flow of the second hemistich, he shortens “me and you” by using “wir”, which forms a consonance of “w”. He prefers “ein'ge Gläser leeren” to “drink a few glasses” in his rendering. To avoid overextension in the first hemistich, Hammer eliminates the repetition of “Blut” by removing its second occurrence after “Eurem”. By using the word *baadeh* for “wine” and *baadeh khordan* for “drinking wine” between these two hemistichs, Hafez forms another repetition which is lost in the translation. The original internal rhyme of the first hemistich is also lost in the translation.

The next distich reads:

Dies ist nicht tadelnswerth, denn Keinem hat's geschadet,

Und ist es tadelnswerth, wo ist der Tadelfreye? (94, 13-14)

Semantically, Hammer’s translation remains faithful to the original in these two hemistichs in all but a few areas. His verb tense in the second clause of the first hemistich is the perfect, Hafez’s the future. In the second hemistich, Hammer omits *che shod* [what would happen] between the

two clauses, perhaps because its translation would not impact on the reader as in the original. Hafez's use of repetition is mirrored in Hammer's translation, except for the fact that the term *eyb* [tadel] occurs in the original four times, and only three times in the translation as Hammer replaced this term once with “-s” in the first clause. A second use of repetition in the original through the word *bovad* has no equivalent in the translation.

The last distich reads:

Geh' über *Wann* und *Wo*, Hafis hinaus und trinke,

Was nützt *Wann* und *Wie*, beim ewigen Beschlusse. (94, 15-16)

The overall semantic structure of this distich parallels the original, although it has a few omissions. Hammer retains the device of *takhallos*, mention of the poet's name, by keeping “Hafis” in the closing couplet of the poem. He deviates from the original text by omitting that name at the beginning of the first hemistich. His attempt to preserve the repetition of “Wann und Wo” fails, partly because of the replacement of “Wie” in the second emergence. This appears to be an omission made for the sake of creating an internal rhyme between “Wie” and “ewigen,” the latter of which is a further addition. Hammer could still create this internal rhyming pattern if his translation for the original *choono chera* [Wie und Warum] had not deviated from the original. Among the rhetorical features of the original, one *tajnis zaed*<sup>31</sup> between *می* [wine] and *دمی* [awhile] remains concealed in the rendering as Hammer omits it.

### 3.1.2. *Rend's Advocacy of Love and Wine*

Love, in Persian lyrical literature, has two significantly different manifestations: physical and spiritual. The interconnectedness of spiritual and earthly worlds within some Hafezian

---

<sup>31</sup> This is a form of pun between two words, in which one word has one more letter than the other.

poems has been a controversial topic among scholars and is a matter that Hammer felt compelled to address in his foreword:

Diese mit Hafisens Worten selbst gegebene sich selbst mehr als einmal widersprechende Darstellung seiner Ansichten ist nicht bloß aus verschiedenen Gaselen gezogen; sondern dieselben Widersprüche, derselbe Absprung vom Wirklichen zum Allegorischen, und vom Uebersinnlichen zum Sinnlichen findet nicht selten in einem einzigen Gasele beysamen, und es erhellet daraus, daß Hafis also weder ganz sinnlich noch ganz allegorisch verstanden werden müße; sondern stellenweise als Herold des Sinnengenußes, und stellenweise als Zunge der mystischen Welt. (I: XLI)

Hammer refers here to the hermeneutical problems of some metaphysical aspects of Hafez's poetry. He encourages his reader to trust his/her own understanding with feet on the ground and head in the heavens while interpreting polemical poems. Elsewhere in his foreword, Hammer renounces any spiritual or mystical aspect of the poems, perhaps in part because of the influence of Sudi, and in part because of the lack of German semantic equivalence. (I: IV-V) In his reading, detached from spiritual connotation, he delighted in Hafez's earthly pleasures of love with his mistress, as here:

Die Geschichten der zartesten, innigsten, reinsten, heftigsten Liebe, welche der Perser in *Chosru* und *Schirin*, und der Araber in *Leila* und *Medschnun* darstellt, sind nur Fabeln in Vergleich mit Hafisens treuer, brennender, geduldig ausharrender, leidenschaftlicher Liebe. Er haucht den Geist aus an der Schwelle der Geliebten, und wenn sie einst an seinem Grabe vorübergeht, so werden Flammen daraus emporschlagen, und ihr Hauch sein morsches Gebein wieder zum Leben erwecken. Und wie sollte er sich nicht opfern für Sie, deren Glanz und Wuchs und Farbe und Duft, Sonne und Mond, Rosen und

Cedern, Veilchen und Narzissen, Moschus und Ambra beschämt, Sie, deren  
Rubinenmund den Augen blutige Thränen auspreßt, deren Wimpern Pfeile schießen vom  
Bogen der Augenbrauen. (I: XXXVIII-IX)

The mass of natural images and sensual responses that Hammer heaps together in these lines is a remarkable example of the physical and erotic emphases in much of Hafez's poetry, which point as well to his philosophy of hedonism. In this view, and in the face of a transient world, he appreciates every moment of being with his beloved physically or imaginatively and thus bends the moment to his enjoyment.

The following examples all focus on the physical, worldly dimension of Hafez's poems. *Ghazal* sixty-seven of the group *Ta* is one of many poems in which the poet sings praise to the beauty of his beloved and expresses his desperate yearning for a reunion after days of separation. Hammer breaks the two-line distich of the original into four lines in his rendering without preserving the rhyming pattern, as evidenced in the first distich:

Immer bin ich betrunken  
Vom Hauche deiner krausen Locken,  
Immer bin ich verstöret  
Vom Blicke deines Zauberauges. (App. 98 "Immer", 1-4)

Semantically, the rendering succeeds in transferring the content of the original. Hammer, however, embellished his lines through his repetition of "Immer bin ich", "Vom" and "deine-", although there isn't a single occurrence of this device in Hafez's version. In the case of "Immer bin ich" the speaker takes the grammatical role of subject, rather than of object as in the original. Stated otherwise, it is the "Hauche deiner krausen Locken" and "Blicke deines Zauberauges" that as immediate subjects intoxicate the speaker. These two metaphorical expressions are well-

translated by Hammer except for a deviation caused by the use of “Blicke”. This deviation could be prevented, for instance, by the term “Berückung”, since a German translation for the literal translation “Betrug” of the original would not have the intended impact on the German reader. Perhaps for this reason and with the purpose of preserving the original connotation of the term, Rosenzweig-Schwannau preferred the term “Schlauheit” in his rendering. (App. “Stets” 104, 3)

Hammer’s second deviation, uninfluenced by Sudi, shows itself in “verstöret”, which seems to be a rather literal translation of the original *Kharab*. The concept *Kharab* belongs to the lexical corpus of the *Divan*, different forms of which Hafez used to refer to drinking and drunkenness. Hammer translated the first instance of this term in the second *ghazal* of the *Divan* as “Betrunkener” and this makes his preference for “verstöret” in this *ghazal* unclear. In addition, he provides no explanation for his first translation of *Kharab* as “verstöret” in *ghazal* fifteen of the group *Ta*. Furthermore, the translation does not recreate the original consonance-based sound patterning of the prosodic qualities of the original, (examples highlighted):

*m*odaam-*a*m *m*ast *m*idarad *n*asim-*e* ja’de gisooyat / *k*haraba*m* *m*ikonad *h*ardam *f*arib-*e* chesh*m*-

*e* jadooyat. The first part of the word *modaam-am* is of special semantic interest due to the crafted rhetorical figure of *ih*aam, amphibology. Hammer’s choice of the word “Immer” communicates the superficial meaning of the word without implying the deeper meaning, “wine”. The suffix “-am” of this word, an inseparable pronoun, corresponds with Hammer’s selection of the separable pronoun “ich”, which deviates from the original as aforementioned by taking the grammatical role of subject.

The next distich reads:

Nach so vieler bestandner

Geduld, o Herr! kann ich nicht einstens

Auf der Brauen Altare

Verbrennen meines Auges Kerze! (98, 5-8)

“[B]eständner” in the first line, in addition to “so vieler”, seems to be superfluous compared to the original which has no adjective for “Geduld”. Moreover, Hammer replaces “in einer Nacht” with the more general term “einstens”. Here, for comparison, is Rosenzweig-Schwannau’s version of this hemistich, which is clearly more faithful to the original: “Könnt’, o Herr, nach solchem Dulden / Einmal nur des Nachts ich schau’n” (App. 104 “Stets”, 5-6). Both renderings, however, singularize the plural subject of the original, lessening its ambiguous quality. Hammer also negates the verb “kann”, an aberration from the original text.

In the second hemistich, corresponding with the last two lines of this rendering, the two metaphors “d[ie] Brauen Altare” and “Verbrennen [d]es Auges Kerze”, the latter referring to the single verb “to see”, belong to the language of the *Divan*. Khorramshahi believes that the device of *ihaam* is crafted in these two expressions. He explains that in an altar candles can be lit for the purpose of providing light or for immolation. (*Hafezname* I: 452) The metaphorical expression “d[ie] Brauen Altare” has a wide semantic spectrum in the *Divan*, wherein Hafez alternates ironically between the prayer-niche of the mosque and the arch-like eyebrow of his beloved. The following examples demonstrate Hafez’s wordplay with the similarity between these two, with the result that it is hard to distinguish between the beloved’s eyebrows and the actual place where his prayers will be answered: “Zeige mir den Altar von deinen Brauen, / Daß zum Morgengebet die Händ' ich hebe” (App. 100 “O Du”, 5-6), and “Ich fürchte meiner Frömmigkeit Ruin. / Der Brauen Hochaltar raubt mir die Ruhe” (App. 99 “Mein”, 9-10). Hafez addresses both God and his beloved in this distich, while Hammer addresses only the former. The sign for the second addressee lies in the suffix “-at” in *Mehraabe abrooy-at* [the altar of your brow], which gets lost



in the translation. This could be shown easily by using “Auf deiner Brauen Altare”, which Hammer ignores, perhaps for the sake of preventing the confused reader from relating “deiner” to “Herr”. There is no equivalence for the paronomasia in the words *didan* [to see] and *dide* [eye] in the rendering.

The next distich reads:

Sorgsam halt' ich in Ehren

Den schwarzen Apfel meines Auges,

Weil er gleichsam ein Abdruck

Vom schwarzen Maal ist, für die Seele. (98, 9-12)

In this distich, Hammer replaces the first clause of the original hemistich with the second clause. There is some minor flexibility in this rendering with respect to the semantic features of the original. There is no equivalence for “Sorgsam” in the original text, through which Hammer aimed at producing the repetition of “-sam” in addition to “gleichsam”. Furthermore, the choice of the words “gleichsam ein Abdruck” for the original *noskhe* seems to be somewhat lengthy. By employing words that communicated multiple meanings, Hafez added to the complexity of this distich in ways that a translator, lacking vocabulary for such subtle complexities, could not. For instance, the first meanings of *Savad* (literacy) and *Noskhe* (prescription) make it impossible for the modern uninitiated reader to associate their deeper meanings of “pupil or black part of the eye” and “example or model”. Moreover, the translation of the metaphorical expression *Savad-e loh-e binesh* (the black disk in the eye) with the literal translation of “the literacy of the disk of the insight” into “Den schwarzen Apfel meines Auges” does not puzzle the reader’s mind as it does in the original. The figurative phrase *Khale hendoo* is another instance of the specific terminology used in the *Divan*. Its superficial meaning “Indian mole” is misleading and not the

intention of the poet in this distich, who by the use of the word actually refers to one of the deeper meanings, “black” or “servant”. (Khorramshahi I: 110) Yet, *Hendoo* can cause an *ihaam* in the original, because it makes the actual subject matter unclear to the reader. The original ambiguity of whether Hafez refers to the black mole, Indian-like mole, or the mole of his beloved’s servant (the last demonstrating the rhetorical figure hyperbole) is eliminated by “schwarzem” in the rendering. Hammer also omits the possessive pronoun “deinen” in the last line, and the use of *tajnis zaed* between **جان** [soul] and **آن** [that] is lost in his version.

The next distich reads:

Wenn du wünschest, auf einmal

Das ew'ge Leben uns zu zeigen,

O so sage dem Ostwind:

Daß er den Wangenschleier lüfte. (98, 13-16)

In the second line here, Hammer replaces the literally-translated “ornament the world forever” with “Das ew'ge Leben uns zu zeigen”. Khorramshahi, the Persian Hafez-expert, sees no deep meaning in this phrase and thus provides no interpretation for this distich in his discussion of the poem. Nevertheless, it is possible that Hammer’s understanding of the line was influenced by his spiritual investment in the work, which is seemingly sparked by Sudi’s lengthy and influential interpretation, which reads: “If you wish to beautify and ornament the world at once, ask the breeze to lift the veil from your face a moment, so the whole world becomes ornamented and illuminated from the radiation of your face, because your face is the pure light and its flame illuminates and ornaments wherever it casts” (I: 585; translation mine). It is unclear whether Hammer found such attributes hyperbolic in their application to a human being, when he knew that it is characteristic of Hafez to put the sun to shame by revealing his beloved’s luminous

moon-like face, causing his audience to ponder whether this beauty is a reflection of divine beauty.

By definition, “Ostwind” or *sabaa* is a breeze that blows at dawn from the east. It is one of the most active poetical images of the *Divan*, which is addressed by Hafez almost as many times as the cup-bearer and the beloved. It functions mainly as the messenger between the lover, Hafez, and his beloved, and is therefore as propitious as Solomon’s hoopoe. *Sabaa*’s most rapturous message for Hafez is the scent of his beloved’s locks or body, evidenced in the following two distichs: “Es hat mir einen Duft der Ost vom Freund gebracht, / Und hat mein irres Herz dadurch zu sich gebracht,” (App. 96 “Es”, 1-2); and “Einen Geruch, o Wind, vom Weg der Freundinn bring’ her. / Meinen Gram trag’ fort, frohe Nachricht bring’ her!” (App. 96 “Einen”, 1-2). The rendering shows further the addition of the vocative “O” in the third line and omission of “einmal” in the fourth. Each hemistich of the original is also divided into clauses. The first clause of both hemistichs consists of three words followed immediately by *keh* [daß] forming a repetition, which in Hammer’s rendering constitutes a homophone between “Das” and “Daß”.

The next distich reads:

Wenn du wünschest, auf einmal

Die Welt entkörpern ganz zu schauen,

Lös' die Locken, es hangen

An jedem Härchen tausend Seelen. (98, 17-20)

The second line of this rendering does not correspond with the original, for which Rosenzweig-Schwannau’s version, despite the omission of “und” in the beginning and “von der Welt” after the second verb, is more accurate: “Wunsch’st du das Gesetz des Todes aufzuheben ganz und gar” (App. 104 “Stets”, 17-18). It is unclear whether Hammer’s reading of this line was

influenced by mysticism, a reading which Khorramshahi explicitly discourages. (*Hafezname* I: 453) Nonetheless, the last two lines effectively transform the content of the second original hemistich. The nidifying of the lover's heart in the beloved's lock recurs in Hafez's treatment of love, which Khorramshahi believes to have emerged in the pre-Hafezian era and passed down to him from his predecessors. (*Hafezname* I: 453) The following two distichs broach the same issue: "Ihr wißt, daß, was ich von dem Schicksal mir erbat, / In Moschus Haar, des Abgotts meiner Liebe war" (App. 97 "Ich", 5-6); and "In den Ringen deiner Locken / Sprach mein Herz, das blöde, nie: / ,Mögest du doch nie vergessen, / Deine Heimath seien sie!" (App. 103 "Des", 9-12). These lines show a common motif of the *Divan* which represents Hafez's beloved as a hunter, in whose curls innumerable hearts are chained.

The next distich reads:

Beide, ich und der Ostwind,

Sind ein Paar verwirrter Thoren;

Ich vom Zauber des Auges,

Und *er* von dem Geruch des Haares. (98, 21-24)

A literal translation of the original distich demonstrates the changes in the translation: "I and the eastern breeze, wretched two vain wanderers / I from your eye's spell intoxicated, and it from the scent of your tress" (Hafez 95; translation mine). Hammer's choice of "verwirrter Thoren" for the "vain wanderers" in addition to the omission of "intoxicated" misleads the reader.

Rosenzweig-Schwannau's selection of "verwirrte Thoren" does not affect the overall context of the distich considering that he preserves equivalence for the verb "to intoxicate". His version, for comparison, reads: "Zwei verwirrte Thoren sind wir, / Ich und jene Morgenluft: / Mich berauscht dein Schelmenauge, / Sie berauscht dein Lockenduft" (App. 104-5 "Stets", 21-4). The

charm of the intoxicated eyes of the indifferent beloved and the scent of her tresses lead to Hafez's lamentation for her. In his lyrical garden, furthermore, the poet-lover at times takes the role of a nightingale or sugar-loving parrot chanting about the beloved's narcissus, cypress, rosebud and red rubies, symbolizing her captivating eyes, graceful figure, mouth and lips, respectively. As Persian grammar makes no gender distinction, the gender of the beloved is often linguistically unspecified, which puts to debate whether homosexuality or spirituality is implied. The translation does not represent the original prosodic quality of consonance (examples highlighted): *man-o baade sabaā meskin do sargardan-e bi hasel / man az afsoon-e cheshmat mast-o oo az booye gisoooyat.*

The last distich reads:

Hoher Geist ward Hafisen!

Von dieser Welt , und von der andern

Springet nichts ihm ins Aug', als

Der Staub der Schwelle deiner Thüre. (99, 25-28)

Overall, Hammer transfers the meaning of the original distich in the four lines of his rendering. His rendering of "Der Staub der Schwelle deiner Thüre" in German, regardless of the deviation from "Gasse" to "Thüre", at least makes one of the Hafezian metaphors accessible to his readers. Hafez goes further in some poems and sweeps the dust off the beloved's threshold with his eyelashes to get her attention. This is one of the frequent themes which can be interpreted secularly or spiritually in the setting of various poems. The metaphorical expression of *be cheshm amadan* [to be valuable in one's eyes] in the context of this poem points to the figure of *ihaam*, the apparent dimension of which is represented by Hammer's version. The latent meaning "Wert sein" gets lost in the translation. The original consonance of the first hemistich

is also not recreated in the translation (examples highlighted): *ehii hemmat keh hafez rast az donya-o az oghba*.

### 3.2. Conclusion

As opposed to the antinomian function of *rend* in the previous poem, this poem reveals the humble and slavish side of this character, whose boundless love to his beloved contrasts with reason. Based on this examination, the translation of the poem does convey the main thematics of the original poem as there was no direct mention of *rend*. In the former poem “Die Fasten ist”, however, the exclusive representation of this character through terms related to drinking and his presence solely as a drunkard eliminated the essence of Hafez’s *rend* and overshadowed the key connotative function of this figure; that is, his hatred of petty ritualism. To grant the reader insight into other dimensions of this multi-functional character, a literal adoption of the term into the target language is necessary, particularly because the reader is already familiar with other personified entities and elements such as *Kalender*, *Huris*, *Derwisch*, etc. through both forewords and their emergence in the renderings. Touching upon Hafez’s mythopoeia and exemplifying a few of the Hafezian mythopoetic creatures not as active as *rend*, Hammer could have welcomed this character into his German version of the *Divan* comfortably, and thus his distortion of the figure remains unclear.

In the above analyses, one can also observe that the translation fails to reproduce Hafez’s original euphonic qualities. Indeed, semantic features appear more frequently preserved than acoustic qualities as well as rhetorical devices derived from them in translations. In part, this is an inevitable consequence of the transformation of the original letters and trying to preserve their sounds. Hammer’s limited access to German semantic equivalences with the same endings

justifies the lack of overall rhyming matches in the translations, which caused critics to rightly call his translation “reimlos” (Radjaie 329) and even a “prose rendering” (Arberry 339). My analysis also showed Hammer’s spiritual reading of some lines which would disagree with those who would criticize him for completely omitting the mystical implications of the poems. My analysis showed further Hammer’s tendency to create “grammatische Unzulänglichkeiten- wie z.B. Wechsel der grammatischen Person-” (Radjaie 333), “unnötige Fügung” (Radjaie 176), “Doppelte Erscheinung” (Radjaie 177) and “zahlreiche Weglassungen [und] Einschreibungen” (Radjaie 330).

Despite these negative aspects, and considering the bulk of his translation, Hammer’s accomplishment is deserving of its frequent citation as the inspiration of many later German works in the field of Persian poetry. The emergence of Goethe’s *West-östlicher Divan* further magnified the importance of Hammer’s pioneering work. In fact, Goethe’s *Divan* bore testimony to Hammer’s accomplishment by introducing an account of Persian classical literature in the body of Hafez’ *Divan*. Hammer’s rendering earned Goethe’s productive reception, which resulted in his subsequent poetical reaction. Goethe’s genius in reproducing such an alien poetical universe through his expertise and combining it with his native poetical elements is evidence of his successful acquaintance with Persian love poetry through Hammer’s version.

#### 4. Johann Wolfgang von Goethe and his *West-östlicher Divan*

Goethe described his acquaintance with Persian poetry and his *West-östlicher Divan* in a letter to Knebel dated 11.1.1815:

So habe ich mich die Zeit her meist im Orient aufgehalten, wo denn freylich eine reiche Erndte zu finden ist ... geht man einmal ernstlich hinein, so ist es vollkommen als wenn man in's Meer geriethe. Indessen ist es doch auch angenehm, in einem so breiten Elemente zu schwimmen und seine Kräfte darin zu üben. Ich thue dieß nach meiner Weise, indem ich immer etwas nachbilde und mir so Sinn und Form jener Dichtarten aneigne. (SWF 7, 393)

Thus, he compiled an example of “Weltliteratur” (Eckermann 198), through which a similar experience could be feasible for his national audience. Although the novel approach of the *West-östlicher Divan* to combine the “Eigene und Fremde” (Weber 13) created confusion in the public reception of the work, its uniqueness was recognized and appreciated by the contemporary literati. Heinrich Heine, for instance, refers to Goethe’s *Divan* with respect to the development of Germany’s literature as “de[r] berauschendste... Lebensgenuß... so leicht, so glücklich, so hingehaucht, so ätherisch, daß man sich wundert wie dergleichen in deutscher Sprache möglich war” (161). He categorizes the magic of the *Divan* as indescribable, in which “die großen goetheschen Gedanken dann, rein und golden, wie die Sterne hervortreten”(160).

The cosmos of the *West-östlicher Divan* through the eyes of an uninitiated western reader differs from that of a reader acquainted with Persian and Hafez’s anthology. The journey of the former through the poems resembles a developing acquaintance with a new poetical horizon, while for the latter it mirrors ceaselessly familiar poetical constellations of his or her national poetry. This chapter aims to highlight a selection of Goethe’s references to Persian poetry in his



*Divan* with an emphasis on Hafezian themes. It will first examine the influence of Hammer's translation on Goethe's perception of Hafez's poetry based on the analysis of the previous chapter, and will then underline his adaptation of Hafezian motifs, which gave the western *Divan* its classical Persian spirit. The specific examples chosen to illustrate this point are the figure of the *rend*, the theme of love, and the difficulties of love, wine and drinking.

In spite of Hammer's omission of the term *rend*, discussed in the previous chapter, the nature of Hafez's *Divan* still made it feasible for Goethe to be drawn to this Dionysian character and his function as a pivotal persona in various contexts. The point seems to be well taken by Goethe, who, not knowing *rend* by name as a reader of Hammer's translation and commentaries, nevertheless illustrated *rend*'s functions through the words of his protagonists in the poems of his *Divan*. His dedication of the entire "Buch der Liebe" and "Buch Suleika" to the theme of love and "Das Schenkenbuch" to wine demonstrates his emphasis on *rend*'s advocacy of such elements. Some poems in these books underline *rend*'s opposition to established rules, laws, and tightly-enforced social mores of the time, but mostly by implication; yet there are also poems in other books in which the character's condemnation of such rules, laws and mores is direct. The first allusion to this characteristic of the *rend* figure occurs in the first lines of "Freysinn"<sup>32</sup>, where the lyrical "I" leaves the domestic traditions behind, galloping to discover a remote and unknown land:

Laßt mich nur auf meinem Sattel gelten!

Bleibt in euren Hütten, euren Zelten!

Und ich reite froh in alle Ferne... (App. 109, 1-3)

---

<sup>32</sup> This poem was first published without a title on 22.03.1816 in an announcement which served as an introduction to the upcoming *Divan* in the *Morgenblatt für gebildete Stände*. (Richter 441)

With the poem's title, Goethe refers not just to the action of the poem but to his unconventional technique in the versification of this and other poems in his *Divan*, which Dill describes as a "sich gegen jede Einschränkung und Unterdrückung wendende[r] Geist" (129). Dill's comment underlines Goethe's boundless spirit in the composition of his verses. It is worth noting that this first suggestion of *rend*'s nature occurs in the first book of the *Divan*, the "Buch des Sängers", in which Goethe's imaginary journey, which coincided with his real journey to the hometowns of his father and mother, Frankfurt am Main and Rhein (Otto and Witte 308) respectively, is reportedly the stimulus. The poem's theme is, in fact, the sense of freedom and open-mindedness of Hafez's *rend* figure and its early mention in the cycle demonstrates its primary importance.

Goethe also thematicizes the concept of *rend*'s liberal-mindedness in the poem "Derb und Tüchtig" of the same book, in which Dill sees "gesteigertes Lebensgefühl, als Grundlage dichterischen Schaffens" (388). Here, Goethe evokes the *rend*'s nature when the character directly addresses false zealots and denounces their void criticism with this reproach:

Mönchlein ohne Kapp'und Kutt'  
Schwatze nicht auf mich ein,  
Zwar du machest mich caput,  
Nicht bescheiden! Nein.  
Deiner Phrasen leeres Was  
Treibt mich davon,  
Abgeschliffen hab' ich das  
An den Solen schon. (App. 108, 21-8).

Ironically, Goethe represents the character of the monk here "ohne Kapp'und Kutt'", in contrast to Hafez's frequent reference to the gown of this character which symbolizes his fake appearance

and thus his hidden hypocrisy. By representing the zealot without a gown, Goethe shows his awareness of the real nature of the character, for he strips him of his disguise. He further condemns the orthodoxy of such characters by confronting them with the modesty of Hafez's antagonist and master, the "weiser Mann", who "von Zeit und Ewigkeit belehren kann" (App. 108, 13-16). To show his adherence to this role model Goethe uses an adaptation of a stanza in Abu'l-Qasim Firdawsi's *Shahname* [*Book of the Kings*]<sup>33</sup>, which he read in Hammer's version in the *Geschichte der Schönen Redekünste Persiens*. (Richter 569) He put this adaptation in the "Buch der Sprüche", where he advises his readers to follow their destiny and the "Weise". (App. 119 "Was", 3) Being aware of the function of Hafez's wise man as one of his legendary personalities, Goethe also had this figure appear in his poems for guidance as a preceptor.

The presence of the "Mönch" creates further discomfort and displeasure in the "Schenkenbuch", in which the poet spends most of his time in the tavern conversing with the cup-bearer. In "Saki", the cup-bearer warns the poet about the presence of the false zealots in the tavern when he says:

Mönche seh ich in den Ecken  
 Wenn du auf die Tafel schlägst,  
 Die sich gleisnerisch verstecken  
 Wenn dein Herz du offen trägst. (App. 114, 5- 8)

The presence of "Mönche" in the tavern serves two purposes in this poem: to reflect Hafez's hatred of zealots and their failure to uphold religious rituals despite their tendency to expect others to do so; and to show the poet's honesty in contrast to the zealot's insincerity. This contrast underlines the polar difference between two characters, a constellation that one faces

---

<sup>33</sup> The first draft of this Iranian national epic was written over twenty-five years by Ferdawsi. It was completed in AD 999. Its 60,000 couplets chronicle the traditional history of ancient kings of Persia to the 7<sup>th</sup> century AD, which marks the fall of the Sasanian dynasty. (Robinson 13)

frequently in Hafez's *Divan*. The reader also hears the voice of the *rend* which is echoed in the words of *Hatem* in the "Schenkenbuch", when he says:

Sie haben wegen der Trunkenheit  
Vielfältig uns verklagt,  
Und haben von der Trunkenheit  
Lange nicht genug gesagt. (App. 115 "Sie", 1- 4)

Goethe's use of the plural pronoun "uns" in the opening lines of this poem further makes the reader question whether he speaks for himself as well as the Persian poet and thereby aims to defend both against harsh criticism. In the *ghazal* form of the poem, with ten distichs maintaining the long rhyming pattern of "-trunkenheit" throughout, Goethe distinguishes between literal and figurative drunkenness and criticizes the zealots' inability to understand the difference. Goethe gives his poem a mystical sense as he defines "göttlichste Betrunkenheit" as a sober drunkenness which is revealed in the complex combination of "Lieb', Lied und Weines Trunkenheit" (Dill 385). As discussed in the first chapter, this interpretation of the original *ghazals* was offered by some commentators to avoid the suggestion of blasphemy.

In another poem, Goethe reflects his awareness of Hafez's dislike of extreme dogmas, and like his mentor rejects them:

Daß ich von Sitte nichts gelernt  
Darüber tadelt mich ein jeder;  
Doch bleib ich weislich weit entfernt  
Vom Streit der Schulen und Catheder.<sup>34</sup> (App. 118 "Was", 9-12)

"Schule" as a symbolic institution for vain wrangles is also rebuked in Hafez's *Divan* and is clearly perceived as a social construct from which both poets, Hafez and Goethe, keep their

---

<sup>34</sup> This poem is an adaptation of one of Hafez's poems that Goethe read in Hammer's translation.

distance. To the Persian poet the official ‘intellect-nourishing’ institutions such as school and science resembled closely the systems he rejected in which faith was bound to hypocrisy and formality. (Khorramshahi, *Hafezname* I: 689) In these lines, the German poet expresses a similar view by rejecting such institutions and their “Catheder”, which Dill defines with the word “Lehrstuhl” (215).

It was surely no accident that Goethe put the poem “Wie ich so” into the “Buch der Betrachtungen”, a body of work he dedicated to “praktischer Moral and Lebensklugheit ... orientalischer Sitte und Wendung gemäß” (Goethe, SWM 11.2, 209), which Richter believes to be a “kritische[r] Blick auf Zeit und Gesellschaft” (519). In this poem he tells his readers about his transformation from an “ehrlich ich” to a “Schelm”, which resembles Hafez’s literary metamorphosis to a *rend* (App. 119 “Wie ich”, 12). Goethe, surrounded by his opponents’ criticism, which Muschg describes as “böse Nachrede der Sitten- und Religionsverderbnis von den Moralisten und Dogmatikern jeder Spielart” (78), reflected his rejection of their critiques in the lines of this poem. With this critical literary eye, Goethe was commenting on the weaknesses of his contemporary literary scene, and instead of following their lead chose to act according to oriental customs in the footsteps of Hafez, whose ideology he well knew. But the poem reveals too that his “ehrlich seyn” caused him ‘Qual’ and ‘Fehlen’ (Dill 149). Thus he capitulated his “Ehrlichkeit” to take on a “Schelm-seyn”, a poetical libertinism, through which he could comfortably project his Weltanschauung. This form of “Schelm-seyn” maintained his “Ehrlichkeit”, for in the end “ehrlich sein / Ist doch das beste” (119, 11-12).

Goethe, wishing to “lieben und trinken” (App. 117 “Unbegrenzt”, 17), like Hafez, emphasizes the *rend*’s bacchanalian nature. Rejuvenated from his imaginary journey and affection for Marianne Jung (soon to become Willemer), whom he met in the summer of 1814 in

Wiesbaden, Goethe dedicated numerous poems to the theme of love and versified his love poems in the books “Buch der Liebe” and “Buch Suleika”. The shorter “Buch der Liebe” was initially titled as the first part of the “Buch Suleika” and introduced the eastern form and convention of love by describing famous traditional oriental couples and the tragically failed love common to them all. The “Buch Suleika” emulates an eastern love affair between two western lovers. Sympathizing with the poet-lover Hafez and knowing his complaints and hardships with respect to love, Goethe and Marianne took these “Musterbilder”<sup>35</sup> (Goethe, SWM 11.1.2, 30) as role models and portrayed their love in the pure Persian clime of this book’s “Duodrama”, a term Goethe used in his explanation of the book on 24.2.1816 in the *Morgenblatt* (qtd. in Otto and Witte 318). As Goethe mentioned in the same source, the presence of the beloved, who actually as the poet-lover’s companion takes the role of female poet, distinguishes this book from the “Buch der Liebe”. Both books retain their individual functions as different reflections on the subject of love.

The “Buch Suleika” could be called a small “romance”. Its characteristics of having two lovers in the disguise of *Hatem* and *Suleika*, who audaciously celebrate their reunion and grieve for their separation in the imaginary oriental milieu of their poems accord to some extent with the standard definition of this genre: “A fictional story in verse or prose that relates improbable adventures of idealized characters in some remote or enchanted setting” (Romance). In the romance of the *West-östlicher Divan*, “Buch Suleika”, the beloved is invited to engage in an unconventional love affair through the first poem “Einladung”. Here, Goethe reminds Hafez readers of the Persian poet’s recurring emphasis on the world’s transience and one’s ensuing responsibility to capture the joy of the moment. To this end, the 65-year-old Goethe constructed for himself the experience of a reportedly “wiederholte[r] Pubertät” (Shareghi 58) so that he

---

<sup>35</sup> “Buch der Liebe” begins with the poem “Musterbilder”.

could enjoy the rejuvenated feelings of a revived lover by devoting himself to the affection of young Marianne. Through the colloquial poems of the book Goethe and Marianne took pleasure in their shared love as well as the moments of their reunion in the characters of *Hatem* and *Suleika*. Behind the mask of these characters and their use of Hafezian terminology, *Hatem* and *Suleika* gave their extreme emotions free expression, which Richter relates rightly to the quality of works of the Sturm and Drang era. (597)

Goethe clarified his abundant use of Hafezian leitmotifs and metaphors in his “Noten und Abhandlungen”. Thereby, he made his readers aware of the confusion of the imagination caused by the endless richness of the Persian poet’s creativity and diversity. He also informed them of Hafez’s technique of representing nature as a surrogate of mythology, a technique which also related to the structural composition of his poems. (SWM 11.1.2, 167-70) In the segment “Übergang von Tropen zu Gleichnissen” of these notes he informs his readers further of the Germans’ general cultural unfamiliarity with the classical Persian allegories and invites them to welcome such novel rhetoric by orientalizing their minds. (SWM 11.1.2, 187) By this request, Goethe asks of his readers a flexible and receptive imagination while wandering through the Orient in his *Divan*.

The difficulties posed by the path of love, the most frequent underlying motif in Hafez’s *Divan*, also becomes the fundamental theme of the “Buch Suleika” in the first dialogue between *Hatem* and *Suleika*, which bears a strong similarity to Suleika’s heart-stealing tendency. In “Nicht Gelegenheit”, *Hatem*’s utterance

Denn sie stahl den Rest der Liebe

Die mir noch im Herzen blieb.

Dir hat sie ihn übergeben

Meines Lebens Vollgewinn... (App. 112, 3-6)

corresponds to one of Hafez's most frequent motifs, as seen in the lines: "Du die mein Herz geraubt mit solcher Zauberkeit... / Du stahlst mein Herz, von selbst geb' ich die Seele dir" (App. 95 "Du", 1 & 9). Hafez's habit of transforming the beloved's heart-stealing act into a voluntary endowment of the heart by the poet-lover is represented in *Suleika's* answer to *Hatem* in the same dialogue when she says:

Und wozu denn auch berauben?

Gieb dich mir aus freyer Wahl,

and

Meine Ruh, mein reiches Leben

Geb'ich freudig, nimm es hin. (App. 116 "Suleika, Hochbeglückt", 5-6 & 11-12)

*Hatem* and *Suleika*, who share a mutual "Herzensraub" (Richter 603), embark upon their adventure in the poetical garden of Hafez wherein they envision themselves briefly as the rose and the nightingale. Goethe's brief mention of these two figures gives his readers just a glimpse of their important roles in Hafez's *Divan*. As Khorramshahi explains, the nightingale is one of the ubiquitous heroes of Persian *ghazals*--in particular those by Hafez and his predecessor Saadi. (*Hafezname* I: 149) Hafez, through the eloquent words of a sweet-sounding nightingale, expresses his love to his beloved, embodied by the rose, and praises her beauty in many of his poems. Goethe recognized the elusive power of Hafez's metaphors, calling the nightingale "unbegreiflich" and the beauty of the rose "unmöglich" in the short poem of "Buch Suleika" "Ist's möglich". (App. 112, 3-4)

Within the Persian milieu, *Suleika* and *Hatem* take inspiration from Hafez's botanical imagery when employing this form of characterization. As mentioned in the previous chapter,



the Persian poet repeatedly used the botanical mode to describe the beauty of his beloved, a technique that Goethe adapted by calling *Suleika* “Cypresse”, pointing to her willowy figure. Goethe offers his reader a genuine Hafezian aura through appropriation of that metaphor in the poem “An Hafis” of “Buch Hafis”, where he sings:

Verzeihe Meister, wie du weißt  
Daß ich mich oft vermesse,  
Wenn sie das Auge nach sich reißt  
Die wandelnde Cypresse.  
Wie Wurzelfasern schleicht ihr Fuß  
Und buhlet mit dem Boden. (App. 107, 9-14)

Calling Hafez his “Meister”, the scene of the stanza shows Hafez’s alter ego in Goethe’s spirit looking longingly at his beloved, who is well-known in the Persian *Divan* for nonchalantly walking away in a graceful way. *Suleika*’s mention of “Lilien, Cypressen, Myrten, Veilchen” (App. 113 “Kenne”, 11 & 13) in addition to the presence of her lover’s rivals, one of Hafez’s active personae, is also evident in the setting of Goethe’s “Kenne wohl”. *Suleika*, surrounded by several admirers, recognizes *Hatem*’s “erkrankend[e]” and “gesundend[e] Blicke” (113, 21-2). Her description of *Hatem*’s eyes, which can both heal and incapacitate the lover simultaneously, reflects Hafez’s frequent use of the contrast in the polar function of his beloved’s love. One of his lines, for example, reads: “Kein Arzt hat Mittel wider meinen Gram, / Ich bin nur durch den Freund<sup>36</sup> gesund und Krank” (App. 100-1, 9-10). The environment pictured by *Suleika* in this poem is, in fact, one that a Hafez reader frequently faces in the original *Divan*, in which the desperate lover sees no hope in winning his beloved’s healing, and at the same time incapacitating, surrounded by rivals’ eyes. This poem seems to have its roots in the “Buch der

---

<sup>36</sup> Hammer had the tendency to masculinize Hafez’s beloved in his translations.

Liebe". It harks back to the poem "Geheimes" there, in which the lyrical "Ich" (App. 110, 3) as "der Wissende" (110, 3) knows the meaning of his "Liebchens Äugeln" (110, 1), who "mit ungeheuren Mächten in die Runde blicket" (110, 9). Richter, in his commentary on this poem, reckons the motif of the power of the beloved's glance to be shared between the eastern and the western poet, which for the latter symbolizes communication and solidarity with her (607), an interpretation which makes sense in the overall context of Goethe's cycle.

In an intimate dialogue between *Hatem* and the emulous *Suleika*, Goethe's use of Hafezian metaphors in describing *Suleika*'s beauty is abundant. In the short poem "Ja! von mächtig" he admits that he versified many poems in praise of her "mächtig holden Blicken", "lächlendem Entzücken", "Zähnen blendend klar", "Moschusduftend Lockenschlangen" and her "[reizumhangenden] Augenwimpern". (111, 1-5) It is interesting to know that the latter two have the potential of killing the lover in Hafez's *Divan*, which is perhaps what Goethe was referring to in the warning "Tausendfältige Gefahr!" (111, 6). Because Goethe was aware of his readers' unfamiliarity with such hyperbolic similes, he was reluctant to make use of these metaphors in the original sense in which they were used in Hafez's *Divan*. Nevertheless, he opened the mind of his audience to these rhetorical flexibilities in his notes and gave them some insight into what these metaphors are capable of representing in the words of *Hafez* and consequently in his readers' minds:

[D]ie Einbildungskraft hat nichts dawider sich die Haarspitzen hakenartig zu denken.

Wenn aber der Dichter sagt, daß er an Haaren aufgehängt sey, so will es uns nicht recht gefallen ... Daß wir von *Wimpern* gemordet werden, möchte wohl angehn, aber an

*Wimpern* gespießt seyn, kann uns nicht behagen; wenn ferner *Wimpern*, gar mit Besen

verglichen, die Sterne vom Himmel herabkehren, so wird es uns doch zu bunt. (SWM 11.1.2, 187)

The following lines from Hammer show why Goethe explained the metaphors in this quotation as he did: “In deinem Locken-Netz hat sich mein Herz verstricket, / Durchbohr's mit einem Blick, es hat es wohl verdient” (App. 99 “In deinem”, 1-2); and “Doch sind die Wimpern, wenn sie koset, / Ein Todespfeil” (App. 95 “Die Stadt”, 11-2). Goethe’s “Buch der Liebe” and “Buch Suleika” have poems in which he adapted these two metaphors. In “Gewarnt”, he admits to experiencing the same feelings:

Auch in Locken hab'ich mich  
Gar zu gern verfangen,  
Und so Hafis! wär's wie dir  
Deinem Freund ergangen. (App. 110, 1-4)

The last two lines of this poem remind us anew of Goethe’s wish to “lieben” (App. 117 “Unbegrenzt”, 17) like Hafez, a goal he attempts to reach partly by adding this metaphor to the canon of his *Divan* by using it in numerous poems. In another poem, “Versunken”, Goethe used an extension of the same metaphor in the dishevelment of his beloved’s curls. The poem narrates intimate moments when the lover rolls his fingers through her disheveled hair. Here again the poet has ‘his friend’ in mind in the final lines: “So hast du Hafis auch gethan, / Wir fangen es von vornen an” (118, 15-6).

Goethe also included one poem containing this metaphor in the same sense in “Buch Suleika”. The opening rhyming lines of one of the most discussed poems, “Locken! haltet mich”, awakens a typically Hafezian scene in the mind of his reader. The stanza reads:

Locken! haltet mich gefangen

In dem Kreise des Gesichts!  
Euch geliebten braunen Schlangen  
Zu erwidern hab' ich nichts. (111, 1-4)

The beloved's curls falling around her moon-like face become a net for the ensnared lover and make him speechless. In the closing stanza of the poem, Goethe intensifies the Hafezian atmosphere by adding the character "Schenke" to the scene, addressing him for the first time and calling for wine: "Schenke her! Noch eine Flasche!" (112, 13), as did Hafez. The active character of the cup-bearer emerges in Hafez to provide comfort to the poet-lover, who in turn seeks relief from his beloved's tyranny and separation from her. Khorramshahi defines three faces for this character in the Persian *Divan*: *Kharabat*'s attractive male servant; at times an equivalent for the beloved; and the mystical eternal beloved. (*Hafezname* I: 160) The presence of the beloved through different faces is an ambiguous quality that tends to challenge the reader in recognizing the intention of the poet. In fact, the distinction between the mystical and earthly beloved, which have an impact on the overall message in some of the poems, is the initial trigger that makes their meaning controversial. It is after this first mention of "Schenke" that the melancholic lines of separation replace the delightful verses of reunion, and where the romance of the book opens a new chapter.

In the poems of this phase, the reader accompanies the protagonists through the grief of separation, a common pattern in Hafez's *Divan*, which represents the unhappy side of the path of love. Goethe explained in the section "Künftiger Divan" of "Besserem Verständniss" the atmosphere of this book, which is "das stärkste der ganzen Sammlung": "Der Hauch und Geist einer Leidenschaft, der durch das Ganze weht, kehrt nicht leicht wieder zurück ..." (SWM 11.1.2, 210). *Hatem*, when removed from *Suleika*, sees himself as a lover "getrennt von [s]einer

Geliebten wie Orient vom Occident” (App. 107 “Bist”, 1-2) and thus “Entfernt von Tag und Licht” (App. 119 “Wie”, 2). Similarly, *Suleika*’s utterances show her “Schmerzen” at this “Trennung”, and, inspired by Hafez’s *Bad-e sabaa*, the eastern breeze, sends *Hatem* her complementary sentiments:

Ach! um deine feuchten Schwingen,

West, wie sehr ich dich beneide:

Denn du kannst ihm Kunde bringen

Was ich in der Trennung leide.

and

Eile denn zu meinem Lieben,

Spreche sanft zu seinem Herzen;

Doch vermeid’ ihn zu betrüben

Und verbirg ihm meine Schmerzen. (App. 115 “Suleika”, 1-4 & 13-16)

*Suleika*, influenced by one of Hafez’s *Rubajats* (Richter 640), modifies the character of *Bad-e saba* to the character of “West[wind]” in this poem. Covetous of “West[wind]”’s ability to see *Hatem*, she tells her messenger that *Hatem*’s “Nähe”(116, 20) can bring her a “Freudiges Gefühl”(116, 19). In an earlier poem by *Suleika*, Hafez’s “Ost[wind]” (App. 116 “Suleika, Was”, 2) emerges, which for her “ [von *Hatem*] frohe Kunde bringt” (2). The presence of “Ost[wind]”, in addition to the “West[wind]” in *Suleika*’s poems, accentuates *Hatem*’s line of “getrennt von [s]einer Geliebten wie Orient vom Occident ” (App. 107 “Bist”, 1-2). The “Ost[wind]” delivers *Suleika* “tausend Grüße von dem Freunde” (117, 4) and her beloved’s “Staube” (116, 5), as it did for Hafez. Goethe also used the element “Staub” in his poem “Alleben” of the “Buch des Sängers”, where he explained its function in Hafez’s *Divan*:

Staub ist eins der Elemente  
Das du gar geschickt bezwingest  
Hafis, wenn zu Liebchens Ehren,  
Du ein zierlich Liedchen singest.

Denn der Staub auf ihrer Schwelle  
Ist dem Teppich vorzuziehen, .... (App. 106, 1-6)<sup>37</sup>

*Hatem* and *Suleika* employ another Hafezian character, *Hudhud*, the hoopoe<sup>38</sup>, as their “Liebesbote” in the poem “Gruss” of the “Buch der Liebe”, in which *Hatem* asks the hoopoe to deliver his eternal love:

Eile doch, Wiedehopf!  
Eile der Geliebten  
Zu verkünden daß ich ihr  
Ewig angehöre. (App. 111, 13-16)

To ease the agony of their separation, *Hatem* also seeks comfort in the company of the character of “Schenke”. Goethe dedicated the entire “Schenkenbuch” to the comforting presence of this character, in whose tavern *Hatem* takes refuge from his suffering. In the poems of this book, we see *Hatem* confiding in “Schenke” and complaining about the absence of his beloved. In the poem “Dichter”, the poet lover describes his “Katzenjammer” to the concerned “Schenke”:

Laß mich jetzt, geliebter Knabe,  
Mir will nicht die Welt gefallen,  
Nicht der Schein, der Duft der Rose,

---

<sup>37</sup> This motif is also discussed in the analysis of Hammer’s translation in the previous chapter. See page 54.

<sup>38</sup> The hoopoe has the reputation of being the messenger of love between Hafez and his beloved in his poems.

Nicht der Sang der Nachtigallen. (App. 108, 1-4)

The lines cultivate Hafez's poetical garden, in which the "Nachtigall" is known to sing for his beloved's companion "die Rose", whose absence leaves the lover voiceless. "Schenke" 's answer to these lines (an offering of wine and talk for support) and his utterances throughout the book emphasize the trustworthiness of this character to the reader. *Hatem*'s closeness to him in return makes their relationship ambiguous and at times makes the "Schenke" a rival to "Suleika", reflecting the Hafezian motif of ambiguity. This ambiguity is interpreted by some critics as a suggestion of homoerotic love, which Goethe addressed and clearly kept at a distance while formulating his own critique in the prose section of his *Divan*. In his explanation for "Das Schenkenbuch" of "Künftiger Divan" he wrote: "Weder die unmäßige Neigung zu dem halb verbotenen Weine, noch das Zartgefühl für die Schönheit eines heranwachsenden Knaben durfte im Divan vermißt werden; letzteres wollte jedoch unseren Sitten gemäß in aller Reinheit behandelt seyn" (SWM 11.1.2, 210). He further called this "Wechselneigung des früheren und späteren Alters ein ächt pädagogisches Verhältniß" (SWM 11.1.2, 211). While it is true that the representation of homoerotic love was customary since the dawn of Persian poetry in the ninth century, one should note that the social rejection of homoeroticism has made such overtones contentious. The gender ambiguity of the Persian language, which frequently leaves the beloved linguistically unspecified in gender, compounded by the fact that in the men's gatherings or at feasts wine was served only by male young servants, supports the suggestion of homoeroticism in this controversy. Admitting the homoerotic implications present in the *Divan*, Khorramshahi still recognizes such implications by Ferdusi, Saadi and Hafez as virtuous and derivative of the traditions of Persian poetry. (*Hafezname* I: 258) The opponents of the theory of homoeroticism, on the other hand, interpret such implications in an oriental mystical sense and understand

“Schenke” as a perfect man who offers a goblet of divine wine to the poet. Aware of the innocence of this fashion, Goethe employed this customary motif in some of his poems in “Schenkenbuch”, wherein intimate moments are shared between *Hatem* and “Schenke”.

#### 4.1. Goethe’s Expression of Hafez’s Philosophy

In the poem “Jene garstige Vettel” of “Das Schenkenbuch”, Goethe summarizes for his readers his understanding of Hafez’s overall approach to life in the original *Divan*:

Jene garstige Vettel,  
Die buhlerische,  
Welt heißt man sie,  
Mich hat sie betrogen  
5 Wie die übrigen alle.  
Glaube nahm sie mir weg,  
Dann die Hoffnung,  
Nun wollte sie  
An die Liebe,  
10 Da riß ich aus.  
Den geretteten Schatz  
Für ewig zu sichern  
Theilt’ ich ihn weislich  
Zwischen Suleika und Saki.  
15 Jedes der beyden  
Beiefert sich um die Wette



Höhere Zinsen zu entrichten.  
 Und ich bin reicher als je.  
 Den Glauben hab' ich wieder!  
 20 An ihre Liebe den Glauben.  
 Er im Becher gewährt mir  
 Herrliches Gefühl der Gegenwart;  
 Was will da die Hoffnung! (App. 112-13, 1-23)

The thematic purposes of the five opening lines are twofold. First, they underline Hafez's stance with regard to the world's transience in addition to his underlying rejection of social, artistic and religious oppression. The following five lines (6-10) develop the last of these subtly in the reader's mind with their reference to "Hoffnung" (7), which is taken psychologically from the poet by the orthodox dogmas of his time. Lines eight to ten highlight the presence of the prominent subject of love, the common topos in Hafez's poetry and central theme of numerous poems in Goethe's *Divan*. Lines eleven to fourteen introduce "Saki" or "Schenke" to this sphere and put him beside the beloved "Suleika". In the footsteps of Hafez, Goethe too "Theilt' ... den geretteten Schatz [, der Liebe,] zwischen Suleika und Saki" (11-4) and that is the reason why following the "Buch der Liebe" he dedicated two separate books to these characters. The reader's inability to distinguish clearly the direction of Hafez's love between these two characters in some of his poems is referred to in the lines: "Jedes der beyden / beefert sich um die Wette" (15-16). Goethe also reflects this ambiguity in some of his poems of the "Schenkenbuch" when he makes the distinction of his love for *Suleika* and *Saki* unclear. Further, in the lines "Er im Becher gewährt mir / Herrliches Gefühl der Gegenwart" (21-2), Goethe

underlines the theme of wine through the presence of “Saki”, which brings him the “Herrliches Gefühl der Gegenwart”. The return in the last line to the subject of “Hoffnung” recalls the same theme in the poem’s opening lines. In the face of the world’s transience, the poet reflects an Hafezian approach by capturing the joy of the moment through his adoration of his beloved and his affection for the relieving function of wine, in personified terms, *Suleika*’s affection and *Saki*’s attention. Thus he cries at the end, “Was will da die Hoffnung!”(23) for someone who has already recognized and won the reward of the present.

#### 4.2. Poem Analysis

Hafez and his predecessor Saadi composed poems about the ambivalence of the words they consciously used in their verses. In this tradition, Goethe addresses Hafezian ambiguity in his poem “Wink” of “Buch Hafis” (App. 120), which followed the widely-quoted poem “Offenbar Geheimniss” on the same subject. Instead of maintaining an original *ghazal* rhyming pattern between the first two hemistichs and the remaining second hemistichs of the poem, the hemistichs of “Wink” rhyme two by two, each forming a self-contained rhyming pattern. The crafted phonetic patterning of assonance in the rhyming words of the opening distich “schelte” and “gelte”, which is partially repeated in the remaining lines, deepens the acoustic quality of the poem.

The first distich of the poem reads:

Und doch haben sie Recht die ich schelte:

Denn daß ein Wort nicht einfach gelte .... (App. 120, 1-2)

The opening distich introduces the theme of the poem to the reader. It validates and agrees with the critics who believe in the ambiguity of Hafez’s verses. Goethe created the consonance “d”

(examples underlined), by which he also formed alliteration between “Denn daß” of the second hemistich. The repetition of “ch” among “Recht”, “ich” of the first hemistich and “nicht” of the second also echoes through the distich.

The next distich and its following line read:

Das müßte sich wohl von selbst verstehn.

Das Wort ist ein Fächer! Zwischen den Stäben

Blicken ein Paar schöne Augen hervor. (120, 3-5)

In this distich, Goethe likens Hafez’s word to the “Fächer”, the semi-transparent space between the “Stäben”, and in this countering makes use of the various connotations of a word. Goethe crafted the rhetorical device of anaphora by beginning both verses with “Das” in this distich. By means of the preposition “Zwischen” to form the dative plural case of “den Stäben” he constructed further the internal rhyme of “-en” in that phrase.

The next distich and its following line read:

Blicken ein Paar schöne Augen hervor.

Der Fächer ist nur ein lieblicher Flor,

Er verdeckt mir zwar das Gesicht; (120, 5-7)

Here Goethe compares “Der Fächer” and its various connotations to a “Flor” or “Schleier” that covers the poet’s intended meaning of the word as expressed by the phrase “mir ... das Gesicht”. With some effort, however, it is still possible for the reader to observe “ein Paar schöne Augen” that symbolize the conceivably valid meanings through the “Stäben” of the “Fächer”. There is an internal rhyme of “-en” in the first hemistich between “Blicken” and “Augen” which is followed by the internal rhyme of “-er” in the second hemistich between “Der”, “Fächer” and “lieblicher”. The repetition of the letter “l” ornaments the phonetic setting of “lieblicher lor”.

The last distich and its following line read:

Aber das Mädchen verbirgt er nicht,

Weil das schönste was sie besitzt

Das Auge, mir in' s Auge blitzt. (120, 8-10)

The reader is presented here with two other metaphors relating to the connotations of a word: “das Gesicht” or “äußerer Wortsinn” (Dill 155) and “das Mädchen” or “Wortbedeutung” (Dill 254). By loading so many metaphors into the description of Hafez’s word, Goethe puzzles his reader, making it difficult to discover which metaphor or, in fact, which word defines “ein Wort” of the first line. In this way Goethe put his reader into the place of a Hafez reader, who has the task of choosing the “right” meaning among various possibilities. The two lines of this last distich rhyme share the syllable “-icht” at the end. The repetition of “r” in both hemistichs further creates an acoustical connection between the two lines, which is emphasized by the second occurrences of “Er”, “ver-” and “das” in the second hemistich (Examples underlined). This final line was versified to meet the poet’s original intention through the mask of words. The metaphor of “das Auge” referring to the “tiefere, verborgene Sinn eines Wortes” (Dill 23), that “in’s Auge blitzt” underlines the ultimate connection of the poet through his words to his readers.

The “Wink” of the title is thus the moment the reader connects the language puzzle created by the poet. In light of the position that “das Auge” for Goethe represents “das zentrale Organ seiner Welterfahrung [und] seine[r] Naturwissenschaft ...,” as Richter puts it (493), his usage of it here can be interpreted as a representation of Hafez’s intention in the selection of his words. Taking into account the preceding lines of “Offenbar Geheimniss”, “Und haben, die Wortgelehrten, / Den Werth des Worts nicht erkannt” (App. 114, 3-4), one can complete one’s perception of Goethe’s objective in “Wink”. In order to resolve the ambiguity of his language,

Goethe recommends that the reader acquire an understanding of Hafez's style prior to engaging in the reading of his work, which requires not "die Wortgelehrten" but a Hafez-initiated reader. He states this well in the introduction to "Besserem Verständnis" in the following line: "Wer den Dichter will verstehen / Muß in Dichters Lande gehen" (SWM 11.1.2, 129). Goethe's use of repetition in the closing distich of the poem is again pronounced. The consonant "s" in the underlined examples in addition to the rhyming pattern of "-itzt" in the closing words of both hemistichs create a melodious tune throughout.

### 4.3. Conclusion

This chapter elucidated Hafez's philosophy through his poetical spokesperson *rend* and his representation in Goethe's poems through the character of *Hatem*. Goethe, in tune with Hafez, condemned the extreme dogmas of his society by implicit and explicit means in the poems of the various books of his *Divan*. In this course, he made direct use of Hafez's characters, such as the false zealot and the wise man, and employed some of Hafez's related elements such as the zealot's "Kapp'und Kutt" and "Schule" in the original sense.

The chapter also demonstrated the intricacy and importance of the acoustical quality of Goethe's poems. The analysis of "Wink" as well as other poems showed variation from the original form of Hafez's poems. In "Wink" Goethe created the rhyming pattern of aa bb, which differs from the form of the *ghazal*, which followed the pattern aa ba ca. Some *Divan* scholars have identified a few poems close to the form of the *ghazal*, among them the widely recognized "Nachbildung" of "Buch des Sängers" and "Buch Suleika"'s "In tausend Formen", while critics such as Ernst Beutler and Emil Staiger see these attempts as unsuccessful (410; III: 20). Wilhelm Solms states in his *Zur Reimlehre des „West-östlichen Divans“*: "Goethe hat sich zwar in

mehreren ‚Divan‘-Gedichten der Ghaselform angenähert, aber er hat, auch wenn diese Gedichte in einigen Kommentaren als Ghaselen bezeichnet werden, ‚formgerechte Ghaselen nicht geschaffen‘ (200). Goethe’s “Verskunst” in the *West-östlicher Divan* has been a controversial topic. He himself described rhyme as bringing “die größten Hindernisse in den Weg” (SWM 11.1.2, 191) and thus worked flexibly with rhyming patterns to overcome the barricade of rhyme in his reproductions. With rare exceptions, Goethe used Kreuzreim either in its full form of abab or in its reduced form of xaya in the versification of his *Divan* poems (Kayser 54), and he made frequent use of phonetic patterning repetition, such as consonance, assonance and alliteration.

Goethe wrote that the “Sinn und Form jener Dichtarten” are two different matters, and hence also should be viewed separately in the example of his *West-östlicher Divan* (Goethe an Knebel 11.1.1815; SWF 7, 393) As shown in this chapter, Goethe’s *Divan* delivers Hafez’s main themes of Lieben, Trinken, Singen in an authentic classical Persian tone that he created primarily through adaptations of Hafezian characters, motifs and metaphors. Filled with deep affection for Marianne Willemer, he reproduced many of Hafez’s metaphors which were connected to his beloved in the dialogues and monologs of “Buch Suleika”. In the free realm of this book, Goethe and Marianne reflected their love for each other in the classical Persian disguise of their verses. Goethe’s dedication of numerous poems to the theme of secular love and wine shows that he did not take great interest in adapting the concept of spiritual love in the same sense as Hafez, however, although, as we saw, his “Sie haben” (App. 115) could be interpreted in a mystical way. A lack of significant studies on the mystical aspects of Goethe’s poems in scholarship to date suggests that the *Divan*’s readers and scholars alike have distanced themselves from a spiritual understanding of the work. Goethe himself did not comment on his treatment of this aspect of Hafez’s poetry, and perhaps this is the key factor that made his audience believe that he

was almost completely uninterested in mysticism. Nevertheless, if we as readers enrich our minds with an eye for the mystical in our reception of the poems, such a perspective in the reading of the *West-östlicher Divan* would open a new horizon for readers and scholarship alike.

## 5. Conclusion

The connection drawn in this thesis between the Hafezian elements of the original *Divan* and their reproduction in Goethe's *Divan* is an original contribution to the scholarship on both works, including Hammer's Hafez translation. Scholarly investigation of Goethe's *Divan* to date includes no similar study. In fact, research to date includes only about a dozen titles bearing the names of both poets, two of which are in the Persian and Korean languages. A very few of these focus on Hafezian elements such as "Ostwind", "Westwind" and "Locke", while a host of studies is dedicated solely to the German version of the *Divan*. German scholarship has also shown great interest in the genesis of the *Divan* and its chronicle, the interpretation of certain poems, the prose section of the *Divan*, and in particular in the love poems of "Buch Suleika". In addition, the last has generated enthusiasm to examine Goethe and Marianne's relationship based on their poems. Scholars have gone further to attempt to reveal the depth of the relationship between Goethe and Marianne through their correspondence during and even after the composition of the *Divan*. German readership has not shown great interest in examining the form of Goethe's poems.

This thesis demonstrates that it was through the means of the lyrical form of the *ghazal* that the Persian poet Hafez captured the attention of his contemporary audience and beyond for centuries. Despite its formal complications, the medium of the *ghazal*, through which Hafez conveyed a universal message, has been recognized internationally as significant for lyrical poetry, or as a German critic put it, "fraglos ein prominentes orientalisches Genre der Weltliteratur" (Birus 25). The analysis of this thesis has examined the peculiarities of this poetical form in Hafez's poetry and their reproduction in Hammer's rendering and Goethe's *West-östlicher Divan*. Through the examples of Hammer's translation it has attempted to shed



light on Goethe's treatment of the original prosodic and semantic structures of Hafez's *ghazals* and their reflection in his own *Divan*.

The analysis of the translation showed Hafez's fondness for embellishing his verses with rhetorical devices and sound patterning, features that made his poems melodious and thus enjoyable to listen to even to readers unacquainted with the poems' content. As shown in the analysis, the first formal prosodic aspect of the *ghazal*, the maintenance of the rhyming pattern aa ba ca was not sustained throughout the selected poems translated by Hammer. This holds true for the majority of his translations, wherein he instead substituted the repetitive mono-rhymes with a *radif* or refrain. The examination of the selected renderings showed also a number of flexibilities with regard to the original *ghazals*, such as frequent supplementation and omission of words and at times repetitions, which occasionally seemed to be carried out for the aesthetic purpose of creating an internal rhyme or reestablishing an original repetition. We could also see instances where the intention of omitting a word and subsequently a repetition remained unclear. Beyond that, however, we saw that for the sake of creating a repetition that was not in the original, Hammer sometimes translated two synonyms with one word (See page 41 for the repetition of "Zeit"). Among the rhetorical devices of the original, the analysis cited frequent examples in which those such as assonance, consonance, homophones, paronomasia, *Tajnis Zaed* and *ihaam* were not reproduced in the rendering. Moreover, in some cases the attempt to produce prosodic sonority had a negative effect on the original semantics. Indeed, the translation's failure to reproduce all of the original prosodic and rhetorical qualities was seen as an inevitable consequence of the transformation of the original language. In other words, while Hammer's stands as a meritorious and important translation, it does differ from the original substantially, even if it has its own, worthwhile, linguistic individuality. In sum, it must be said of Hammer's

translation that the transformation of the original poetic system caused the failure of qualities particularly so that many of the original attributes did not reach the target language. For instance, one should note the strict two-fold challenge that Hammer faced in reproducing repetitive mono-rhymes: he had to maintain the original meaning while sustaining the rhyming letters in his selection of words.

Some scholars have gone so far as to blame the unrhymed translation by Hammer for Goethe's lack of interest in reproducing rhymed verses in his poems. (Birus 131; Solms 201) Despite the fact that only a few of the poems in the *West-östlicher Divan* show a *ghazal*-like rhyming pattern, the diversity of the patterns was fascinating for Goethe's audience, so that they saw the *Divan* as "eine bunte Fülle" (Kayser 49). Thus the poems, despite their inability to produce *ghazal* form rhyming patterns throughout, proved themselves capable nevertheless of representing a novel form of rhyming pattern to their audience besides their novel content. Equally novel to Goethe's audience was "the artistic unity of the work..., the dynamic continuity within the bewildering labyrinth of the poems[, which] remain[ed] hidden" (Ohlendorf 562). This quality in Goethe's *Divan*, in its ability to challenge the minds of readers to pursue a logical continuity in the poems, reminds one of the controversy about the lack of unity in Hafez's poems themselves. Thus, Goethe's *Divan* poses the question of unity to his reader, as Hafez's *Divan* did, only on a different scale.

With regard to the semantic features of Hafez's poems, the analysis proved Hammer's faithfulness to the original, despite some minor deviations such as grammatical divergences. However, Hammer's omission of the pivotal character of *rend* and replacement of *rend* with literary references to drinking and drunkenness tarnished the momentous message of the Persian *Divan*'s protagonist. In this regard, the analysis, which also considered Sudi's Turkish

translation, Hammer's primary source for his rendering, did not attribute this omission of the *rend* to Sudi's influence. That omission was seen as a strikingly negative feature of Hammer's work. On the positive side, however, Hammer's rendering included most of Hafez's other motifs and metaphors, which fascinated his reader, Goethe, who in turn did not hesitate to employ them in the poems of his *West-östlicher Divan*.

In his exploration of Hafezian themes, Goethe's reproductions of Hafezian metaphors and motifs created an authentic classical Persian aura. The analysis of them also showed that there were repeated and meaningful references to the free-spirited character of Hafez's *rend*, even though Goethe did not know by name through Hammer's translation. The claim that Goethe gained a profound understanding of Hafez even through Hammer's flawed rendering is proven true when a reader who is well acquainted with Hafez's poems and thought meets Goethe's *Hatem* who represents the character of Hafez's *rend*. Without knowing that such an open-minded character did indeed inhabit Hafez's poetical world, and feeling the need for such a character himself, Goethe created the persona of *Hatem*. Through the words of *Hatem* he then felt free to sing his love for *Suleika*, the disguised married Marianne Willemer, and his rejection of social norms, just as the *rend* figure helped Hafez to free himself from the social and religious shackles of his time. Although the public audience was confused by Goethe's novel work when it appeared, because it combined eastern and western poetry, the intellectual reception was welcoming of Hafez's message through the work of their countryman. Goethe's *Hatem* is as different in the eyes of his audience as Hafez's *rend* was to his, and in this state of difference, they both engage and challenge the imaginations of their readers. The personality of these characters and those of the poets became at times so intermingled that the reader finds it hard to distinguish between the fictional characters and their creators in both *Divans*. Goethe's portrayal

of the Weltanschauung of Hafez's *rend* in his poems through his *Hatem* fills the absence of *rend* and essentially conveys the fundamentals of his message in a new form. Goethe, in the footsteps of Hafez, and Hafez in the footsteps of his classical Persian predecessors both brought novelty to the literatures and cultures of their age.

## **Bibliography**

### **Primary Literature**

Goethe, Johann Wolfgang von. *Faust: Der Tragödie zweiter Teil*. Stuttgart: Reclam, 1968.

---. *Goethes Werke* [SWW]. Herausgegeben im Auftrag der Großherzogin Sophie von Sachsen.

Ed. Hermann Böhlau. 143 vols. Japan: Sansyusya. 1975.

---. *Johann Wolfgang Goethe: Sämtliche Werke. Briefe. Tagebücher und Gespräche* [SWF]. 40

vols. Ed. Dieter Borchmeyer. Frankfurt am Main: Deutscher Klassiker, 1986-99.

---. *Sämtliche Werke nach Epochen seines Schaffens* [SWM]. 21 vols. Ed. Karl Richter.

München: Hanser, 1985-98.

Hafez, Shamseddin Mohammad. *Divan-e Hafez [Divan of Hafez]*. Mashad: Entesharate Astone

Ghodse Razawi, 1378 [1997/8].

Hammer, Joseph von. *Der Diwan. Aus dem Persischen zum ersten Mal ganz übersetzt von*

*Joseph von Hammer*. Nachdruck der Ausgabe Stuttgart, Tübingen, Cotta

von 1812. Erster und Zweiter Teil. Kelkheim: YinYang Media, 1999.

Sattarzadeh, Ismat. *Sharh-e Sudi bar Hafez [Sudi's commentary on Hafez]*. 4 vols. Tehran:

Rangin, 1963.

Sudi, Mohammad. *Sharh-e Sudi bar Hafez [Sudi's commentary on Hafez]*. 4 vols. Trans. [from

Turkish] Ismat Sattarzadeh. Tehran: Rangin, 1963.

### **Secondary Literature**

Arberry, Arthur J. *Classical Persian Literature*. London: George Allen & Unwin, 1958.

---. *Fifty Poems of Hafiz*. 1947. Cambridge: UP, 1962.

Arjomand-Fathi, Nushafarin. "Hafez und Goethe: Studien zum Literarischen Einfluss und zu

- Goethes Hafez-Bild." Diss. University of California, 1983. Ann Arbor: UMI. 1983.
- Beutler, Ernst. *West-östlicher Divan*. Leipzig: Dietrich, 1943.
- Birus, Hendrik. "Goethes Annäherung an das Ghasel und ihre Folgen." *Orientdiskurse in der Deutschen Literature*. Ed. Klaus-Michael Bogdal. Bielefeld: Aisthesis, 2007. 125- 40.
- Browne, Edward G. *A Literary History of Persia: The Tartar Dominion*. 4 vols. Great Britain: Cambridge University Press, 1956.
- Burdach, Konrad. "Goethes West-östlicher Divan." *Goethe Jahrbuch* 17 (1896): 1 - 40. Bürgel, Johann Christoph. *Drei Hafis-Studien: Goethe und Hafis, Verstand und Liebe bei Hafis, Zwölf Ghaselen übertragen und interpretiert*. Liebefeld/Bern: Lang, 1975.
- Caton, Margaret Louise. *Hafez: Erfan and Music as Interpreted by Ostad Morteza Varzi*. California: Mazda, 2008.
- Dashti, Ali. *Naghschi az Hafez [An Image of Hafez]*. Tehran: Ebne Sina, 1336 [1957].
- Davis, Dick. "On Not Translating Hafez." *New England Review*. 25. 1/2 (2004). 12 December 2008 <[http://lion.chadwyck.com.proxy.lib.uwaterloo.ca/searchFulltext.do?id=R04070844&divLevel=0&queryId=../session/1246643648\\_9265&trailId=121A741AFA2&area=abel&forward=critref\\_ft](http://lion.chadwyck.com.proxy.lib.uwaterloo.ca/searchFulltext.do?id=R04070844&divLevel=0&queryId=../session/1246643648_9265&trailId=121A741AFA2&area=abel&forward=critref_ft)>.
- De Bruijn, J.T.P. *Persian Sufi Poetry: An Introduction to the Mystical Use of Classical Persian Poems*. Richmond: Curzon, 1997.
- Dill, Christa. *Wörterbuch zu Goethes West-östlichem Divan*. Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1987.
- Dryden, John. *Of dramatic poesy, and other critical essays*. London: Dent, 1962.
- Dynes, Wayne R. and Stephen Donaldson, eds. *Asian Homosexuality*. New York : Garland Pub., 1992.
- Eckermann, Johann Peter. *Gepräche mit Goethe in den letzten Jahren seines Lebens*. Ed.

- Otto von Regine. Berlin: Aufbau, 1982.
- Farzad, Massud. *To Translate Hafez*. Tehran: Roschenai, 1935.
- Ghani, Qasim. *Tarikh-e Asr-e Hafez [History of Hafez's time]*. 2 vols. 10<sup>th</sup> ed. Tehran: Entesharat-e Zavar, 1386 [2007].
- Gibb, Elias John Wilkinson. *A History of Ottoman Poetry*. 6 vols. London: Luzac, 1900.
- Hammer Purgstall, Joseph von. *Dufkörter, aus Persischen Dichtern Gesammelt*. Stuttgart: Brodhag, 1836.
- Heine, Heinrich. *Zur Geschichte der Religion und Philosophie in Deutschland*. 8/1 Vol. Ed. Manfred Windfuhr. Hamburg: Hoffmann und Campe, 1979. 16 vols.
- Hillmann, Michael C. *Unity in the Ghazals of Hafez*. Minneapolis & Chicago: Bibliotheca Islamica, 1976.
- Homayoun-Farrokh, Roknaldin. *Tarikhe Hashthezar Sale Sher-e Farsi [The Eight Thousand Year History of the Persian Poem]*. 2 vols. Diss. U Newport, 1987. Tehran: Nashre Elm, 1370 [1991].
- Horn, Paul. *Geschichte der Persischen Literatur*. Leipzig: Amelangs, 1909.
- Iqbal, Muhammad. *The Moonbeams Over the East: A Translation of Poems from Allama Iqbal's Payam-i-Mashriq (The Message of the East) with an Introduction and Notes*. Trans. Syed Abbas Ali Jaffery. Karachi: Royal Book Company, 1996.
- Jami, Nur ad-Din Abd ar-Rahman. *Nafahat al-Uns [Zephyrs of Tranquility]*. Tehran: Saadi, 1958.
- Kayser, Wolfgang. *Kunst und Spiel: Fünf Goethe-Studien*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1967.
- Khorramshahi, Bahaeddin. *Hafez*. Tehran: Tarhe now, 1994.

- . *Hafezname [Book of Hafez]*. 2 vols. Tehran: Entesharate Elmi va Farhangi, 1366 [1987].
- Leaf, Walter. *Versions from Hafiz: An Essay in Persian Metre*. London: Grant Richards, 1898.
- Levy, Reuben. *An Introduction to Persian Literature*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1969.
- Lewis, Franklin. "Hafez and Music". *The Encyclopedia Iranica Online*. 5 March, 2009.  
 <<http://www.iranica.com/newsite/index.isc?Article=http://www.encyclopediairanica.com/newsite/articles/unicode/v11f5/v11f5004g.html>>.
- Loloi, Parvin. *Hâfiz, Master of Persian Poetry: a Critical Bibliography : English Translations Since the Eighteenth Century*. London; New York: Tauris, 2004.
- Mallah, Hosseinali. *Hafez va Moosighi [Hafez and music]*. Tehran: Entesharat Fahang va Honar, 1363 [1984].
- Meisami, Julie Scott. *Medieval Persian Poetry*. New Jersey: Princeton UP, 1987.
- . "The Ghazal as Fiction: Implied Speakers and Implied Audience in Hafiz's Ghazals." *Intoxication, Earthly and Heavenly: Seven Studies on the Poet Hafiz of Shiraz*. Eds. Bürgel, J. Christoph and Michael Glünz. Bern: Peter Lang, 1991. 89-103.
- Melzer, Uto v. *Farhangnevis: Materialien zu einem Persisch-Deutschen Wörterbuch*. 4 vols. Ed. Nosratollah Rastegar. Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2006.
- Mina, Nima. *Anmerkungen zu Joseph von Hammer-Purgstalls Hafis-Übersetzung*. Graz: Medienfabrik, 2007.
- Mommsen, Katharina. *Goethe and Diez: Quellenuntersuchungen zu Gedichten der Divan-Epoche*. Berlin: Akademie, 1961.
- . Introduction. *West-Eastern Divan*. Trans. John Whaley. Berne: Peter Lang, 1998.



- Muschg, Adolf. *Goethe als Emigrant: Auf der Suche nach dem Grünen bei einem alten Dichter*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1986.
- Ohlendorf, Harald. "The Poet and his Masks: Some Remarks on Implicit Structures in Goethe's 'West-östlicher Divan'". *The Modern Language Review* 69.3 (1974). 6 April 2009 <<http://www.jstor.org/stable/3724192>>.
- Otto, Regine and Bern Witte. *Goethe Handbuch: Gedichte*. 4 vols. Vol 1. Eds. Theo Buck, Hans-Dietrich Dahnke and Peter Schmidt. Stuttgart: Verlag J. B. Metzler, 1996.
- "Qasida." *The New Princeton Encyclopedia of Poetry and Poetics Online*. 1993. Literature Online. 20 December 2008 <[http://lion.chadwyck.com/searchFulltext.do?id=R00793984&divLevel=0&queryId=../session/1229808833\\_26484&trailId=11DBBD2CD76&area=ref&forward=critref\\_ft](http://lion.chadwyck.com/searchFulltext.do?id=R00793984&divLevel=0&queryId=../session/1229808833_26484&trailId=11DBBD2CD76&area=ref&forward=critref_ft)>.
- Radjaie, Ali. *Das Profan-Mystische Ghasel des Hafis in Rückerts Übersetzungen und in Goethes „Divan“*. Diss. Karl-Ruprechts-Universität Heidelberg, 1996. Würzburg: Ergon, 1998.
- Reichl, Sepp. *Hammer-Purgstall: Auf den romantischen Pfaden eines österreichischen Orientforschers*. Graz: Leykam, 1973.
- Richter, Karl, ed. *West-östlicher Divan*. Johann Wolfgang von Goethe. *Sämtliche Werke nach Epochen seines Schaffens*. 21 vols. München: Hanser, 1985-98. Vol.11.1.2. (1998).
- Robinson, B.W., and Eleanor Sims. *The Windsor Shahnama of 1648*. Eds. Julian Roby and Delia Gaze. London: Azimuth, 2007.
- Roemer, Hans Robert. *Probleme der Hafizforschung und der Stand ihrer Lösung*. Mainz: Verlag der Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur, 1951.
- "Romance." *The Oxford Dictionary of Literary Terms*. Chris Baldick. Oxford University Press, 2008. *Oxford Reference Online*. Oxford University Press. University of Waterloo. 2 May

- 2009 <<http://www.oxfordreference.com.proxy.lib.uwaterloo.ca/views/ENTRY.html?subview=Main&entry=t56.e997>>.
- Rosenzweig-Schwannau, Vincenz Ritter v. *Diwan des Grossen Lyrischen Dichters Hafis*. 3 vols. Wien: Druck und Verlag Der K. K. Hof- und Staatsdruckerei, 1858-64.
- Rückert, Friedrich. *Übersetzungen Persischer Poesie: Ausgewählt und Eingeleitet von Annemarie Schimmel*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1966.
- Rypka, Jan. *History of Iranian Literature*. Ed. Karl Jahn. Holland: Reidel, 1968.
- Sakhai, Kambiz. "Suhrawardi, Hafiz and Zoroaster." *Vohuman: A Zoroastrian Educational Institute*. 18 August 2006. Vohuman.org. 12 February 2009. <<http://www.vohuman.org/Article/Suhrawardi,%20Hafiz%20and%20Zoroaster.htm>>.
- Schimmel, Annemarie. *Stern und Blume: Die Bilderwelt der persischen Poesie*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1984.
- Seifert, Siegfried. *Goethe Bibliographie: 1950- 1990*. 3 vols. Eds. Rosel Gutsell & Hans-Jürgen Malles. München: Saur, 2000.
- Shafa, Shojaeddin, trans. *Divan-e Shargi-ye Johann Wolfgang Goethe [The Eastern Divan of Johann Wolfgang Goethe]*. Tehran: Nakhostin, 1385 [2006].
- Shareghi, Caveh. "Goethes Kenntnisse über den Orient und seine Begegnung mit dem persischen Dichter Hafis." *Gottes ist der Orient! Gottes ist der Occident! Goethe und die Religionen der Welt*. Eds. Beutin, Wolfgang and Thomas Metscher. Bad Segeberg: Lang 2000. 51-75.
- Shamel, Mir Shafiq. "Goethe and Hafiz: Poetry and History in the West-oestlicher Divan." Diss. Stanford University, 2007. Ann Arbor: UMI. 2007.
- Solbrig, Ingeborg H. *Hammer-Purgstall und Goethe: "Dem Zeubermeister das Werkzeug"*. Bern:

- Lang, 1973.
- Solms, Wilhelm. "Des Reims „holder Lustgebrauch“: Zur Reimlehre des „West-östlichen Divans“." *Goethe Jahrbuch* 99 (1982): 195 - 229.
- Staiger, Emil. *Goethe*. 3 vols. Zürich: Atlantis, 1959.
- Tafazoli, Hamid. Email to the author. 22 Jan. 2009.
- Tamimdari, Ahmad. *The Book of Iran: A History of Persian Literature: Schools, Periods, Styles, and Literary Genres*. Trans. Ali Salami. Tehran: Alhoda, 2002.
- Weber, Mirjam. *Der „Wahre Poesie-Orient“: Eine Untersuchung zur Orientalismus-Theorie Edward Saids am Beispiel von Goethes „West-östlichem Divan“ und der Lyrik Heines*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2001.
- Wild, Inge. "Goethe's *West-östlicher Divan* als poetischer Ort Psycho-kultureller Grenzüberschreitungen." *Westöstlicher und Nordsüdlicher Divan: Goethe in Interkultureller Perspektive*. Ed. Ortrud Gutjahr. Paderborn: Schöningh, 2000. 73- 88.
- Zarrinkub, Abdolhossein. *Az kucheye Rendan: darbareye Zendegi va Andisheye Hafez [Through the streets of rogues: about Hafez's life and thought]*. Tehran: Sokhan, 1373 [1994].

## Appendices

These appendices contain poems quoted or referred to in the thesis. They are arranged in their individual groups in alphabetical order according to the German title or, if untitled, the first German line of the poem. Poems without highlighted portions are discussed in full in the thesis. In the case of poems with parts highlighted, only those highlighted parts are included in the discussion.

|   |            |
|---|------------|
| <b>Appendix 1 (Source: Hammer Purgstall)</b><br><b>Hafez through Hammer's rendering</b>   | <b>94</b>  |
| <b>Appendix 2 (Source: Bürgel)</b><br><b>Hafez through Johann Christoph Bürgel's rendering</b>  | <b>102</b> |
| <b>Appendix 3 (Source: Rosenzweig-Schwannau)</b><br><b>Hafez through Vincenz Ritter v. Rosenzweig-Schwannau's rendering</b>             | <b>103</b> |
| <b>Appendix 4 (Source: Goethe, <u>Sämtliche Werke</u> 1985-98, 11.1.2)</b><br><b>Hafez through Goethe's <i>West-östlicher Divan</i></b> | <b>106</b> |

**Appendix 1**  
**Hafez through Hammer's rendering**

**Ruse jeksu schud u id amed u dilha berchast.**

Die Fasten ist vorbei! das Fest ist da, auf sind die Herzen,  
Im Fasse gährt der Wein, nun ist es Zeit zu fodern.

Vorbei ist izt die Zeit, der schweren Tugendprahler,  
Die Zeit der Wonn' und Lust, für Trunk'ne ist gekommen,

- 5 Verdienet der wohl Schimpf, der fröhlich, wie ich, trinket,  
Dies ist nicht schändlich, ist nicht dumm und schmähhlich.

Ein Trunkner ohne Falsch und ohne Gleisnerei,  
Ist besser als ein Schalk, in Kloster und in Zellen.

- 10 Was recht ist wollen wir, und Niemand Böses thun,  
Vom Uebrigen sey unser Spruch: Es ist erlaubt.

Der Wein kommt von dem Blut der Rebe, nicht von Eurem.  
Was soll's, wenn werden wir, der Gläser ein'ge leeren?

Dies ist nicht tadelnswerth, denn Keinem hat's geschadet,  
Und ist es tadelnswerth, wo ist der Tadelfreye?

- 15 Geh' über *Wann* und *Wo*, Hafis hinaus und trinke,  
Was nützt *Wann* und *Wie*, beim ewigen Beschlusse. (I: 180)

**Mahem in hafta schud si schehr u bescheschmem salist.**

Die Stadt verließ seit einer Woche  
Mein Mond, mir scheints ein Jahr;  
Du kennest nicht der Trennung Leiden,  
Wie schwer sie sind.

- 5 Ich sah von meinen schwarzen Augen  
Auf ihr den Widerschein,  
Und meint', es sey auf ihren Wangen  
Ein Moschusmaal.

10 Es träufelt Milch von ihren Lippen,  
Süß wie das Zuckerbrod,  
Doch sind die Wimpern, wenn sie koset,  
Ein Todespfeil.

15 Du, die ob ihrer Seelengüte  
Mit Fingern zeigt die ganze Stadt,  
Warum bekümmerst du so wenig  
Um Freunde dich?

20 Ich zweifle nicht mehr, ob es eine  
Karfunkelperle giebt?  
Dein Mund beweiset zur Genüge  
Die Wahrheit mir.

Du würdest, hieß die frohe Kunde,  
Bey mir vorübergehn,  
Verwirf nicht den Entschluß, er ist  
Ein gutes Loos.

25 Wie trägt Hafis? die Felsenbürde  
Von deinem Trennungsleid,  
Er, der durch Klagen und durch Weinen  
Zusammenschwand. (I: 98-9)

### **Ei bürde dilemra tu bedin schekl u schamail.**

Du die mein Herz geraubt mit solcher Zauberkraft,  
Du hast vor Niemand Furcht, die ganze Welt ist dein.  
Aus meinem Herzen kömmt bald Ach! und bald dein Pfeil,  
Wie soll ich sagen was mein Herz erlitten hat.

5 Wie soll ich vom Rubin wohl sprechen vor dem Feind?  
Gefärbte Waare taugt für solche Thoren nicht.  
Da deiner Schönheit Macht von Tag zu Tage wächst,  
So kann der Mond nicht mehr dir gegenüber stehn.

10 Du stahlst mein Herz, von selbst geb' ich die Seele dir,  
Ich gebe gern, was thut es des Einsammlers noth?  
Es trat dein Fuß Hafis in das Harem der Liebe,  
Umschling' des Freundes Saum, auf Andres thu' Verzicht. (II: 139)

**Ei Saba nukehti es chaki rehi jar.**

Einen Geruch, o Wind, vom Weg der Freundinn bring' her.  
Meinen Gram trag' fort, frohe Nachricht bring' her!

- Sag' mir ein Wort von ihr, das Geist und Seele neu macht,  
Einen Brief von ihr, stille Kunde bring' her.  
5 Bringe mir einen Staub, der Nebenbuhler sey blind!  
Einen Staub zum Trost blut'ger Augen bring' her!  
Wonnegenuß ist nicht im Herzen roher Sinnart,  
Bring' mir deßhalb stets die Kund' vom Schelmenaug' her.  
Daß ich mit deinem Hauch erfrisch' den Sinn des Wohldufts,  
10 Bringe Düfte mir der Geliebten, mir her!  
Bringe bei deiner Treu' vom fernen Weg des Freund's Staub,  
So doch, daß solches nicht Fremde merken, mir her!  
Lange schon hat mein Herz geseh'n des Wunsches Ziel nicht.  
Schenk'! o bringe reine Becher mir her!  
15 Dankbar für's Wohlseyn, für die Freyheit, Säng' der Flur,  
Bring' zum Käficht mir Kund' vom Rosenbeet her.  
Ferne von ihr war ich, und bitter mir Geduld ward,  
Bringe einen Kuß von den Lippen mir her.  
Färbe Hafisens Kleid mit purpurfarbnem Weine,  
20 Bringet ihn dann selbst trunken von dem Markt her. (II: 9-10)

**Saba vakti sahar buji si sulfi jar mi averd.**

Es hat mir einen Duft der Ost vom Freund gebracht,  
Und hat mein irres Herz dadurch zu sich gebracht,

- Ich riß aus meinem Busen das Pistazienreis,  
Denn jede Blüt' hat mir Schmerzen nur gebracht.  
5 Mein Herz ward von der Frucht des Lieberaub's befreyt,  
Doch da es blutete, ward es in Hut gebracht.  
Ich sah auf ihrem Dach den hellen Glanz des Monds,  
Wie ihrer Sonne Schein aus Schaam ganz aufgebracht;  
Auf's Wort des Schenken geh' ich manchesmal hinaus,  
10 Denn schwer wird Nachricht uns von jenem Weg gebracht.  
Was der Geliebte schenkt, ist nichts als milde Huld,  
Es sey durch Rosenkranz, durch Gürtel zugebracht.  
Verzeih's den Brauen Gott! sie haben mich entseelt,  
Allein sie haben auch Liebkosung mir gebracht.  
15O schöne Zeit, da durch das Lockenhaar des Freund's  
Mein Herz den Feind selbst zum Geständniß gebracht.  
Der Ost voll Eifersucht auf seines Haars Duft

Streut Moschus aus, den er von Tartarn hergebracht.  
Das Glas gab gestern mir gar wunderlich Hafis,  
20 Ich zankte nicht, er hat es als *Sofi* gebracht. (I: 402-3)

### **Ghulami nerkesi mesti tu tadschdaraned**

Herrscher sind die Sklaven von deinen Narzißen,  
Weise sind berauschet von deinen Rubinen,  
Wie der Ostwind gehe vorbei bei den Veilchen,  
Sieh, was deine Locken für Unheil gestiftet.  
5 Dich verrieth der Ostwind, mich aber die Thränen,  
Niemals bleibt versteckt das Geheimniß der Liebe.  
Deine Rosenwangen besing' ich mit nichten,  
Tausend Nachtigallen lobpreisen dieselben.  
Gehst du deine doppelten Locken vorüber, <sup>3</sup>  
10 Sieh die Unbeständigen, welche dran haften.  
*Eden* ist uns einstens zum Loose bestimmt,  
Denn gewiß verdienen die Sünder Erbarmung.  
Geh' zur Schenk' und röthe dein Angesicht dorten,  
Geh' nicht in die Zelle, dort wohnen die Gleißner.  
15 Du mein *Chiser*, sey mir gesegnet und hilf mir;  
Denn ich bin zu Fuß, und die Anderen reiten.  
Niemals sey Hafis von den Haaren befreyet,  
Denn nur deine Sklaven sind Freye zu nennen. (I: 240)

### **Didem buhaubi chosch ki bedestem piale bud.**

Ich träumte, daß in meiner Hand ein Becher war,  
Daß all' mein Seyn dem Schicksal überlassen war;  
Durch vierzig Jahre litt ich Gram und Schmerz,  
Bis daß ein Wein, zwey Jahre alt, die Heilkraft war.  
5 Ihr wißt, daß, was ich von dem Schicksal mir erbat,  
In Moschus Haar, des Abgotts meiner Liebe war;  
Ich war betäubt vom Morgenrausch, da lächelte  
Das Glück, so süß, daß wieder Wein im Becher war.  
Ich trinke Blut, und ich beklage mich doch nicht,  
10 Weil einst vom Tisch der Gnaden dies die Nahrung war;  
  
Ich trinke Blut dort an der Schenke Thür',  
Von Ewigkeit mir dieses vorbestimmt war.



Ich geh' mit Fleh'n und Weinen zu der Thür',  
Weil auf mein Fleh'n die Thüre sonst mir offen war.  
15 Wer liebelos, der Schönheit Blume nie gepflückt,  
Gleicht jenem, der im Wind der Tulpen Hüter war.  
Des Morgens gieng ich an dem Rosenbeet vorbei,  
Dort wo *Bülbül* in tiefem Schmerz versenket war.  
Ich sah, daß wenn Hafis den Schah im Liede pries,  
20 Ein Vers mehr werth als hundert andre Lieder war.  
Den großen Schah, vor welchem an dem Tag der Schlacht  
Die Sonn' im Leuen nichts anders als ein Hirsche war. (I: 345-6)

### **Mudamem mest midared nesimĩ dschaadĩ Kisujet**

Immer bin ich betrunken  
Vom Hauche deiner krausen Locken,  
Immer bin ich verstöret  
Vom Blicke deines Zauberauges.

5 Nach so vieler bestandner  
Geduld, o Herr! kann ich nicht einstens  
Auf der Brauen Altare  
Verbrennen meines Auges Kerze!

10 Sorgsam halt' ich in Ehren  
Den schwarzen Apfel meines Auges,  
Weil er gleichsam ein Abdruck  
Vom schwarzen Maal ist, für die Seele.

15 Wenn du wünschest, auf einmal  
Das ew'ge Leben uns zu zeigen,  
O so sage dem Ostwind:  
Daß er den Wangenschleier lüfte.

Wenn du wünschest, auf einmal  
Die Welt entkörpern ganz zu schauen,  
Lös' die Locken, es hangen  
20 An jedem Härchen tausend Seelen.

Beide, ich und der Ostwind,  
Sind ein Paar verwirrter Thoren;  
Ich vom Zauber des Auges,  
Und *er* von dem Geruch des Haares.

- 25 Hoher Geist ward Hafisen!  
Von dieser Welt , und von der andern  
Springet nichts ihm ins Aug', als  
Der Staub der Schwelle deiner Thüre. (I: 146)

**Predami sülfî tu dil muhtelai chuischten est.**

In deinem Locken-Netz hat sich mein Herz verstricket,  
Durchbohr's mit einem Blick, es hat es wohl verdient.

Wenn meines Herzens Wunsch von deinen Händen kommet,

- Sey schnell, es ist das Gute hier an seinem Orte.  
5 An deiner Seite schwör' ich es, mein süßer Abgott,  
Wie Kerzen will ich mich des Nachts für dich verbrennen.

Als du auf Liebe sannst, *Bülbüil* hab' ich gesprochen:  
Thu's nicht, denn selbstisch sorgt die Rose ihretwegen.  
Der Moschus Sina's braucht nicht erst des Rosenduftes,

- 10 Die Blase nimmt den Wohlgeruch vom eignen Kleide.  
Geh' nicht in den Pallast empfindungsloser Herren,  
Der Schatz des Heiles liegt zu deinen eignen Füßen.  
Verbrannt ist zwar Hafis, allein im Bund der Liebe  
Hält er stets fest, was Treue sich bedinget. (I: 138)

**Bala pülend ischveger nakschbasi men.**

Mein hohes Liebchen, voll Liebkosungen,  
Hat die Enthaltbarkeit mir abgekürzt.  
Siehst du, was Alter, Tugend, Wissenschaft  
Mir angethan hat, sprach ich zu dem Liebchen.

- 5 Die Thränen haben mich in Gluth gestürzt,  
Sie haben mein Geheimniß ausgeplaudert.  
Mein Freund ist trunken, denk' des Freundes nicht.  
Der Schenke gnädig für die Armen lebe.

- 10 Ich fürchte meiner Frömmigkeit Ruin.  
Der Brauen Hochaltar raubt mir die Ruhe.  
Wie Kerzen lächelnd wein' ich über mich.  
O steinern Herz, was macht die Fluth und Flamme!  
Ich mahl' ein Bild auf meiner Thränen Fluth,

- Wann wird, o Herr! das Bildliche erst wirklich?  
15 O Herr! wann weht der Hauch des Morgenwinds,  
Durch dessen Duft ich einst gerettet werde?  
O Mönch! Nichts kömmt aus dem Gebet heraus,  
Viel besser ists, bey Tag und Nacht zu trinken.  
Der Gram verzehrt Hafisen, sag's, o Wind!  
20 Dem Schah, der Freunde nährt, und Feinde sengt. (II:280-81)

### **Ci ghaib si nasar beschuda misiparemet.**

- O Du, ferne von mir! sey Gott befohlen!  
Ich Verbrannter, ich bin Dir gut von Herzen.  
Glaub' nicht, daß ich die Hand von deinem Saume  
Lasse, bis mich das Tuch des Grabes umwickelt.  
5 **Zeige mir den Altar von deinen Brauen,**  
**Daß zum Morgengebet die Händ' ich hebe.**  
Soll nach *Babel* ich gehen, zum Zaubrer *Harut*,  
Alles würde versucht, dich mitzunehmen.  
Du, verleihe mir Kraft, daß zu den Füßen  
10 Perlen ich streu' aus meinen Augen.  
Sieh', es fließet der Strom von meinen Thränen,  
Daß der Saamen der Lieb' aus Dir entspieße.  
Du vergoßest mein Blut, den Gram der Trennung  
Nahmst du aber hinweg, mit deinen Dolchen.  
15 Daß ich sterbe, das willst du ungetreuer  
Arzt! den Knaben besuch', er harret Deiner.  
Wein und Märchen Hafis geziemen dir nicht,  
Auch das kleinste Vergehn werd' ich bestrafen. (I: 141-2)

### **Ta sajei mubareket uflad ber serem**

- So lang dein Schatten auf den Kopf mir fällt,  
Bin ich der Diener, bin ich der Sklav' des Glücks.  
Schon manche Jahre sah' ich nicht das Glück,  
Mit deinem Hochgenuß kam es zu mir.  
5 Kein Mensch wird auf der Welt mich wachend sehn,  
Wenn mir gewiß dein Bild im Traum' erscheint.  
Unendlich lang' leb' ich mit deinem Schmerz,  
Doch ohne Dich nicht einen Augenblick.  
**Kein Arzt hat Mittel wider meinen Gram.**

- 10 **Ich bin nur durch den Freund gesund und krank.**  
Du sprachst, verweile nicht in meinem Gau,  
Ich gehe deinetwegen nicht vorbei.  
Ein Jeder dient dem Schah und dem Wesir.  
Der Kleinste von des Sultans Sklaven ist Hafis. (II: 170-1)

## Appendix 2

### Hafez through Johann Christoph Bürgel

Das Fasten entwich; das Fest kam und die Herzen *erstanden!*  
Der Wein im Fässerhaus kam in Wallung, und Wein muß man (jetzt) *bestellen!*

Die Periode der lästigen Tugendbolde ist vergangen.  
Die Zeit des Freisinns / Schelmentums und des frohen Treibens der Freigesinnten /  
Schelme is *vorhanden*.

- 5 Welcher Makel haftet an dem, der so trinkt?  
Was ist das für ein Makel mit diesem Übermut? Was ist das für ein *Vergehen*?

Ein Weingenießer, in dem kein Falsch und keine Heuchelei / Augendienst ist,  
ist besser als ein Tugendbold, in dem Falsch und *Heuchelei* ist.

Wir sind keine Freigesinnten / Schelme des Augendienstes / der Heuchelei, noch  
Gesellen der Unaufrichtigkeit / Heimtücke.

- 10 Der, der das Innere kennt, ist dieses Umstandes *Zeuge*.<sup>39</sup>

Die göttlichen Gebote wollen wir (in Kraft) lassen und niemand Böses tun;  
Und das, was, sie sagen, unstatthaft ist, (von dem) sagen wir nicht, es sei *statthaft!*

Was (aber) tut es, wenn ich und du ein paar Gläser Wein trinken?  
Der Wein stammt doch vom Blut der Reben her, nicht von *euerm* Blute!

- 15 Was ist das für ein Makel / Verstoß, aus dem kein Schaden erwächst?  
Und wäre es einer, was täte das? Wo ist ein *makel-* / *fehlerloser* Mensch?

Hafis, laß Wie und Warum und trinke ein Weilchen Wein!  
Nach seiner (: Gottes) Verordnung- wo ist Platz für Wie und *Warum*? (55-6)

---

<sup>39</sup> This distich is omitted by Hammer.

### Appendix 3

#### Hafez through Vincenz Ritter v. Rosenzweig-Schwannau's rendering

Des verreisten Freund's erwähnte  
Gestern Nachts des Winkes Weh'n ;

Ich auch Weih' mein Herz dem Winde:  
Mag was immer nun gescheh'n!

5 Schon so weit ist es gekommen,  
Dass mit mir gefühlvoll klagt

Jeder helle Blitz am Abend,  
Jeder Wind, wenn 's wieder tagt.

10 In den Ringen deiner Locken  
Sprach mein Herz, das blöde, nie :

„Mögest du doch nie vergessen,  
Deine Heimath seien sie !“

Was der Kath der Theuren gelte.  
Sah ich heute deutlich ein.

15 Lass, o Herr, die Seele dessen,  
Der mir rieth, befriedigt sein!

Blut'gen Herzens dacht' ich deiner,  
Band der Wind auf grünem Moos

20 Sanft die Schleifen' vom Gewände  
Einer Rosenknospe los.

Deine schiefe Königsmutze  
Kam mir immer in den Sinn.

Trug der Wind den Schmutz der Kronen  
Auf Narzissenhäupter hin.

25 Als bereits mein schwacher Körper  
Meiner Hand entglitten war. "

Gab der Wind mir neues Leben

Morgens durch dein duftend Haar.

30 O Hafis! Was du gewünscht  
Bringt dein Edelmuth dir ein:

Mögen sich dem edlen Menschen  
Fürder alle Seelen weih'n! (I: 413)

**Stets** Berauschen mich die Düfte  
Deines krausen Lockenhaars;

Stets verwüstet mich **die Schlaueit**  
Deines Zauberaugenpaars.

5 **Könnst', o Herr, nach solchem Dulden**  
**Einmal nur des Nachts ich schau'n**

Meines Auges Kerze brennen  
Auf dem Altar deiner Brau'n!

10 Meines Auges schwarze Scheibe  
Wird von mir so hochgeehrt,

Weil der Seele sie ein Abbild  
Deines Indermaals<sup>2</sup> gewährt.

Willst du dieses ganze Weltall  
Schmücken mit der reichsten Zier,

15 Sag'dem Ost, er heb' ein wenig  
Vom Gesicht den Schleier dir!

**Wünsch'st du das Gesetz des Todes**  
**Aufzuheben ganz und gar,**

20 Schüttele dich, und tausend Seelen  
Fallen dir aus jedem Haar.

**Zwei verwirrte Thoren sind wir,**  
**Ich und jene Morgenluft:**

Mich berauscht dein Schelmenauge,  
Sie berauscht dein Lockenduft.

25 O des hohen Sinn's Hafisens!  
Hier so wie in jener Welt

Ist's der Staub nur deines Dorfes,  
Der ihm in das Auge fällt. (I: 218-19)



**Appendix 4**  
**Hafez through Goethe's *West-östlicher Divan***

**Alleben**

Staub ist eins der Elemente  
Das du gar geschickt bezwingest  
Hafis, wenn zu Liebchens Ehren,  
Du ein zierlich Liedchen singest.

5      Denn der Staub auf ihrer Schwelle  
Ist dem Teppich vorzuziehen,  
Dessen goldgewirkte Blumen  
Mahmuds Günstlinge beknieen.

10     Treibt der Wind von ihrer Pforte  
Wolken Staubs behend vorüber,  
Mehr als Moschus sind die Düfte  
Und als Rosenöl dir lieber.

15     Staub den hab' ich längst entbehret  
In dem stets umhüllten Norden,  
Aber in dem heißen Süden  
Ist er mir genugsam worden.

20     Doch schon längst daß liebe Pforten  
Mir auf ihren Angeln schwiegen!  
Heile mich Gewitterregen,  
Laß mich daß es grunelt riechen!

Wenn jetzt alle Donner rollen  
Und der ganze Himmel leuchtet,  
Wird der wilde Staub des Windes  
Nach dem Boden hingefeuchtet.

25     Und sogleich entspring ein Leben,  
Schwillt ein heilig, heimlich Wirken,  
Und es grunelt und es grünert  
In den irdischen Bezirken. (20)

## An Hafis

Was alle wollen weißt du schon  
Und hast es wohl verstanden:  
Denn Sehnsucht hält, von Staub zu Thron,  
Uns all' in strengen Banden.

- 5 Es thut so weh, so whol hernach,  
Wer sträubte sich dagegen?  
Und wenn den Hals der eine brach,  
Der andre bleibt verwegen.

- 10 Verzeihe Meister, wie du weißt  
Dass ich mich oft vermesse,  
Wenn sie das Auge nach sich reißt  
Die wandelnde Cypresse.

- 15 Wie Wurzelfasern schleicht ihr Fuß  
Und buhlet mit dem Boden;  
Wie leicht Gewölk verschmilzt ihr Gruß  
Wie Ost-Gekos ihr Oden. (27)

- Bist** du von deiner Geliebten **getrennt**  
**Wie Orient vom Occident,**  
Das Herz durch alle Wüste rennt,  
Es giebt sich überall selbst das Geleit,  
5 Für Liebende ist Bagdad nicht weit. (80)

## Derb und Tüchtig

- Dichten ist ein Übermuth,  
Niemand schelte mich!  
Habt getrost ein warmes Blut  
Froh und frey wie ich.
- 5 Sollte jeder Stunde Pein  
Bitter schmecken mir;  
Wüрд' ich auch bescheiden seyn  
Und noch mehr als ihr.

10 Denn Bescheidenheit ist fein  
Wenn das Mädchen blüht,  
Sie will zart geworben seyn  
Die den Rohen flieht.

15 Auch ist gut Bescheidenheit  
Spricht ein weiser Mann,  
Der von Zeit und Ewigkeit  
Mich belehren kann!

20 Dichten ist ein Übermuth!  
Treib' es gern allein.  
Freund und Frauen, frisch von Blut,  
Kommt nur auch herein.

Mönchlein ohne Kapp' und Kutt'  
Schwatze nicht auf mich ein,  
Zwar du machest mich caput,  
Nicht bescheiden! Nein.

25 Deiner Phrasen leeres Was  
Treibet mich davon,  
Abgeschliffen hab' ich das  
An den Solen schon.

30 Wenn des Dichters Mühle geht  
Halte sie nicht ein:  
Denn wer einmal uns versteht  
Wird uns auch verzeihn. (19)

### **Dichter**

Laß mich jetzt, geliebter Knabe,  
Mir will nicht die Welt gefallen,  
Nicht der Schein, der Duft der Rose,  
Nicht der Sang der Nachtigallen. (100)

## Elemente

Aus wie vielen Elementen  
Soll **ein ächtes Lied** sich nähren?  
Daß es Layen gern empfinden,  
Meister es mit Freuden hören.

5 **Liebe** sey vor allen Dingen  
Unser Thema, wenn wir singen;  
Kann sie gar das Lied durchdringen,  
Wird's um desto besser klingen.

10 Dann muß Klang der Gläser tönen,  
Und **Rubin des Weins** erglänzen:  
Denn für Liebende, für Trinker  
Winkt man mit den schönsten Kränzen.

15 Waffenklang wird auch gefodert,  
Daß auch die Trommete schmettre;  
Daß, wenn Glück zu Flammen lodert,  
Sich im Sieg der Held vergöttre.

Dann zuletzt ist unerläßlich,  
**Daß der Dichter manches hasse,  
Was unleidlich ist und häßlich**  
20 Nicht wie Schönes leben lasse.

Weiß der Sänger dieser Viere  
Urgewalt'gen Stoff zu mischen,  
Hafis gleich wird er **die Völker  
Ewig freuen und erfrischen.** (14)

## Freysinn

**Laßt mich nur auf meinem Sattel gelten!  
Bleibt in euren Hütten, euren Zelten!  
Und ich reite froh in alle Ferne,  
Über meiner Mütze nur die Sterne.**

5 Er hat euch die Gestirne gesetzt  
Als Leiter zu Land und See;  
Damit ihr euch daran ergötzt,  
Stets blickend in die Höh. (11)

## Geheimes

Über meines Liebchens Äugeln  
Stehn verwundert alle Leute,  
Ich, der Wissende, dagegen  
Weiß recht gut was das bedeute.

5 Denn es heißt: ich liebe diesen,  
Und nicht etwa den und jenen,  
Lasset nur ihr guten Leute  
Euer Wundern, euer Sehnen.

10 Ja, mit ungeheuren Mächten  
Blicket sie wohl in die Runde;  
Doch sie sucht nur zu verkünden  
Ihm die nächste süße Stunde. (36)

## Gewarnt

Auch in Locken hab' ich mich  
Gar zu gern verfangen,  
Und so Hafis! wär's wie dir  
Deinem Freund ergangen.

5 Aber Zöpfe flechten sie  
Nun aus langen Haaren,  
Unterm Helme fechten sie,  
Wie wir wohl erfahren.

10 Wer sich aber wohl besann  
Läßt sich so nicht zwingen:  
Schwere Ketten fürchtet man,  
Rennt in leichte Schlingen. (32)

## Gruss

O wie selig ward mir!  
Im Lande wandl' ich  
Wo Hudhud über den Weg läuft.  
Des alten Meeres Muscheln

5 Im Stein sucht' ich die versteinen,  
Hudhud lief einher  
Die Krone entfaltend.  
Stolzirte, neckischer Art,  
Über das Todte scherzend  
10 Der Lebend'ge.  
Hudhud, sagt' ich, fürwahr!  
Ein schöner Vogel bist du.  
Eile doch, Wiedehopf!  
Eile der Geliebten  
15 Zu verkünden daß ich ihr  
Ewig angehöre.  
Hast du doch auch  
Zwischen Salomo  
Und Saba's Königin  
20 Ehemals den Kuppler gemacht! (34-5)

### Hatem

Ja! von mächtig holden Blicken,  
Wie von lächelndem Entzücken  
Und von Zähnen blendend klar,  
Moschusduftend Lockenschlangen,  
5 Augenwimpern reizumhangen  
Tausendfältige Gefahr!  
Denke nun wie von so langem  
Prophezeyt Suleika war. (72)

### Hatem

Locken! haltet mich gefangen  
In dem Kreise des Gesichts!  
Euch geliebten braunen Schlangen  
Zu erwidern hab' ich nichts.  
5 Nur dies Herz es ist von Dauer,  
Schwillt in jugendlichstem Flor;  
Unter Schnee und Nebelschauer  
Rast ein Aetna dir hervor.

Du beschämst wie Morgenröthe

10 Jener Gipfel ernste Wand,  
Und noch einmal fühlet Hatem  
Frühlingshauch und Sommerbrand.

**Schenke her! Noch eine Flasche!**

Diesen Becher bring ich Ihr!

15 Findet sie ein Häufchen Asche,  
Sagt sie: der verbrannte mir. (79-80)

### **Hatem**

Nicht Gelegenheit macht Diebe,  
Sie ist selbst der größte Dieb,

**Denn sie stahl den Rest der Liebe  
Die mir noch im Herzen blieb.**

5 **Dir hat sie ihn übergeben  
Meines Lebens Vollgewinn,**  
Daß ich nun, verarmt, mein Leben  
Nur von dir gewärtig bin.

10 Doch ich fühle schon Erbarmen  
Im Carfunkel deines Blicks  
Und erfreu' in deinen Armen  
Mich erneuerten Geschicks. (68)

**Ist's** möglich daß ich Liebchen dich kose!  
Vernehme der göttlichen Stimme Schall!

**Unmöglich scheint immer die Rose,  
Unbegreiflich die Nachtigall.** (69)

**Jene** garstige Vettel,  
Die buhlerische,  
Welt heißt man sie,  
Mich hat sie betrogen  
5 Wie die übrigen alle.  
Glaube nahm sie mir weg,  
Dann die Hoffnung,

Nun wollte sie  
An die Liebe,  
10 Da riß ich aus.  
Den geretteten Schatz  
Für ewig zu sichern  
Theilt' ich ihn weislich  
Zwischen Suleika und Saki.  
15 Jedes der beyden  
Beeifert sich um die Wette  
Höhere Zinsen zu entrichten.  
Und ich bin reicher als je.  
Den Glauben hab ich wieder!  
20 An ihre Liebe den Glauben.  
Er im Becher gewährt mir  
Herrliches Gefühl der Gegenwart;  
Was will da die Hoffnung! (100-1)

**Kenne** wohl der Männer Blicke,  
Einer sagt: ich liebe, leide!  
Ich begehre, ja verzweifle!  
Und was sonst ist kennt ein Mädchen.  
5 Alles das kann mir nicht helfen,  
Alles das kann mich nicht rühren;  
Aber Hatem! deine Blicke  
Geben erst dem Tage Glanz.  
Denn sie sagen: *Die* gefällt mir,  
10 Wie mir sonst nichts mag gefallen.  
Seh ich Rosen, seh ich **Lilien**,  
Aller Gärten Zier und Ehre,  
So **Cypressen, Myrten, Veilchen**,  
Aufgeregt zum Schmuck der Erde,  
15 Und geschmückt ist sie ein Wunder,  
Mit Erstaunen uns umfangend,  
Uns erquickend, heilend, segnend,  
Daß wir uns gesundet fühlen,  
Wieder gern erkranken möchten.  
20 Da erblicktest du Suleika  
Und gesundetest **erkrankend**,  
Und erkranketest **gesundend**,  
Lächeltest und sahst herüber  
Wie du nie der Welt gelächlet.  
25 Und Suleika fühlt des Blickes  
Ewge Rede: *Die* gefällt mir



Wie mir sonst nichts mag gefallen. (70-1)

### Offenbar Geheimniss

Sie haben dich heiliger Hafis  
Die mystische Zunge genannt,  
Und haben, die Wortgelehrten,  
Den Werth des Worts nicht erkannt.

5 Mystisch heißest du ihnen,  
Weil sie närrisches bey dir denken,  
Und ihren unlautern Wein  
In deinen Namen verschenken.

10 Du aber bist mystisch rein  
Weil sie dich nicht verstehn,  
Der du, ohne fromm zu seyn, selig bist!  
Das wollen sie dir nicht zugestehn. (26)

### Saki

Denk, o Herr! wenn du getrunken  
Sprüht um dich des Feuers Glast!  
Prasselnd blitzen tausend Funken,  
Und du weißt nicht wo es faßt.

5 Mönche seh ich in den Ecken  
Wenn du auf die Tafel schlägst,  
Die sich gleisnerisch verstecken  
Wenn dein Herz du offen trägst.

10 Sag' mir nur warum die Jugend,  
Noch von keinem Fehler frey  
So ermangelnd jeder Tugend  
Klüger als das Alter sey.

15 Alles weißt du was der Himmel  
Alles was die Erde trägt,  
Und verbirgst nicht das Gewimmel  
Wie sich's dir im Busen regt.(103)

**Sie haben wegen der Trunkenheit**  
**Vielfältig uns verklagt,**  
**Und haben von der Trunkenheit**  
**Lange nicht genug gesagt.**

5 Gewöhnlich die Betrunkenheit  
Verschwindet so wie es tagt;  
Doch hat mich meine Betrunkenheit  
In der Nacht umher gejagt.  
Es ist die Liebestrunkenheit

10 Die mich erbärmlich plagt,  
Von Tag zu Nacht, von Nacht zu Tag  
In meinem Herzen zagt.  
Dem Herzen das in Trunkenheit  
Der Lieder schwillt und ragt,

15 Daß keine nüchterne Trunkenheit  
Sich gleich zu heben wagt.  
**Lieb', Lied und Weines Trunkenheit,**  
Ob's nachtet oder tagt,  
**Die göttlichste Betrunkenheit**

20 Die mich entzückt und plagt. (98-9)

### Suleika

**Ach! um deine feuchten Schwingen,**  
**West, wie sehr ich dich beneide;**  
**Denn du kannst ihm Kunde bringen**  
**Was ich in der Trennung leide.**

5 Die Bewegung deiner Flügel  
Weckt im Busen stilles Sehnen,  
Blumen, Augen, Wald und Hügel  
Stehn bey deinem Hauch in Thränen.

Doch dein mildes sanftes Wehen

10 Kühlt die wunden Augenlider;  
Ach für Leid müsst' ich vergehen,  
Hofft' ich nicht zu sehn ihn wieder.

**Eile denn zu meinem Lieben,**  
**Spreche sanft zu seinem Herzen;**  
15 **Doch vermeid' ihn zu betrüben**  
**Und verbirg ihm meine Schmerzen.**

Sag ihm, aber sag's bescheiden:  
Seine Liebe sey mein Leben,  
Freudiges Gefühl von beyden  
20 Wird mir seine Nähe geben. (87-8)

### Suleika

Hochbeglückt in deiner Liebe  
Schelt ich nicht Gelegenheit,  
Ward sie auch an dir zum Diebe  
Wie mich solch ein Raub erfreut!  
5 Und wozu denn auch berauben?  
Gieb dich mir aus freyer Wahl,  
Gar zu gerne möcht ich glauben-  
Ja! ich bin's die dich bestahl.

Was so willig du gegeben  
10 Bringt dir herrlichen Gewinn,  
Meine Ruh, mein reiches Leben  
Geb'ich freudig, nimm es hin.

Scherze nicht! Nichts von Verarmen!  
Macht uns nicht die Liebe reich?  
15 Halt ich dich in meinen Armen,  
Jedem Glück ist meines gleich. (69)

### Suleika

Was bedeutet die Bewegung?  
Bringt der Ost mir frohe Kunde?  
Seiner Schwingen frische Regung  
Kühlt des Herzens tiefe Wunde.  
5 Kosend spielt er mit dem Staube,  
Jagt ihn auf in leichten Wölkchen,  
Treibt zur sichern Rebenlaube  
Der Insecten frohes Völkchen.  
10 Lindert sanft der Sonne Glühen,  
Kühlt auch mir die heißen Wangen,

Küßt die Reben noch im Fliehen,  
Die auf Feld und Hügel prangen.

Und mir bringt sein leises Flüstern  
Von dem Freunde tausend Grüße;

15 Eh noch diese Hügel düstern  
Grüßen mich wohl tausend Küsse.

Und so kannst du weiter ziehen!  
Diene Freunden und Betrübten.

20 Dort wo hohe Mauern glühen  
Find' ich bald den Vielgeliebten.

Ach! die wahre Herzenskunde,  
Liebeshauch, erfrischtes Leben  
Wird mir nur aus seinem Munde,  
Kann mir nur sein Athem geben. (85-6)

### **Unbegrenzt**

Daß du nicht enden kannst das macht dich groß,  
Und daß du nie beginnst das ist dein Loos.  
Dein Lied ist drehend wie das Sterngewölbe,  
Anfang und Ende immer fort dasselbe,  
5 Und was die Mitte bringt ist offenbar,  
Das was zu Ende bleibt und Anfangs war.

Du bist der Freuden ächte Dichterquelle,  
Und ungezählt entfließt dir Well' auf Welle.  
Zum Küssen stets bereiter Mund,  
10 Ein Brustgesang der lieblich fließet,  
Zum Trinken stets gereizter Schlund,  
Ein gutes Herz das sich ergießet.

Und mag die ganze Welt versinken,  
Hafis mit dir, mit dir allein  
15 Will ich wetteifern! Lust und Pein  
Sey uns den Zwillingen gemein!  
Wie du zu lieben und zu trinken  
Das soll mein Stolz, mein Leben seyn.

Nun töne Lied mit eigenem Feuer!  
20 Denn du bist älter, du bist neuer. (25)

## Versunken

Voll Locken kraus ein Haupt so rund!-  
Und darf ich dann in solchen reichen Haaren,  
Mit vollen Händen hin und wieder fahren  
Da fühl' ich mich von Herzensgrund gesund.  
5 Und küß' ich Stirne, Bogen, Auge, Mund,  
Dann bin ich frisch und immer wieder wund.  
Der fünfgezackte Kamm wo sollt' er stocken?  
Er kehrt schon wieder zu den Locken.  
Das Ohr versagt sich nicht dem Spiel,  
10 Hier ist nicht Fleisch, hier ist nicht Haut,  
So zart zum Scherz, so liebeviel!  
Doch wie man auf dem Köpfchen kraut,  
Man wird in solchen reichen Haaren  
Für ewig auf und nieder fahren.  
15 So hast du Hafis auch gethan,  
Wir fangen es von vornen an. (32)

**Was, in** der Schenke, waren heute  
Am frühesten Morgen für Tumulte?  
Der Wirth und Mädchen! Fackeln, Leute!  
Was gab's für Händel, für Insulte?  
5 Die Flöte klang, die Trommel scholl!  
Es war ein wüstes Wesen-  
Doch bin ich, Lust und Liebe voll,  
Auch selbst dabey gewesen.

10 Daß ich von Sitte nichts gelernt  
Darüber tadelt mich ein jeder;  
Doch bleib ich weislich weit entfernt  
Vom Streit der Schulen und Catheder. (99)

**Was machst** du an der Welt sie ist schon gemacht,  
Der Herr der Schöpfung hat alles bedacht.  
Dein Loos ist gefallen, **verfolge die Weise**,  
Der Weg ist begonnen vollende die Reise:  
5 Denn Sorgen und Kummer verändern es nicht,  
Sie schleudern dich ewig aus gleichem Gewicht. (57)

**Wie ich** so **ehrlich** war  
Hab ich **gefehlt**,  
Und habe Jahre lang  
Mich durch **gequält**;  
5 Ich **galt** und galt auch nicht,  
Was sollt es heißen?  
Nun wollt ich **Schelm seyn**  
Thät mich befließen;  
Das wollt mir gar nicht ein  
10 Mußt mich zerreißen.  
Da dacht ich **ehrlich seyn**  
**Ist doch das beste**,  
War es nur kümmerlich  
So steht es feste. (41)

**Wie sollt'** ich heiter bleiben  
**Entfernt von Tag und Licht?**  
Nun aber will ich schreiben  
Und trinken mag ich nicht.  
5 Wenn sie mich an sich lockte  
War Rede nicht im Brauch,  
Und wie die Zunge stockte  
So stockt die Feder auch.  
Nur zu! geliebter Schenke,  
10 Den Becher fülle still.  
Ich sage nur: Gedenke!  
Schon weiß man was ich will. (81)

## **Wink**

Und doch haben sie Recht die ich schelte:  
Denn daß ein Wort nicht einfach gelte  
Das müßte sich wohl von selbst verstehn.  
Das Wort ist ein Fächer! Zwischen den Stäben  
5   Blicken ein Paar schöne Augen hervor.  
Der Fächer ist nur ein lieblicher Flor,  
Er verdeckt mir zwar das Gesicht;  
Aber das Mädchen verbirgt er nicht,  
Weil das schönste was sie besitzt  
10   Das Auge, mir in's Auge blitzt. (27)