

## Wordtrade Reviews: Relevant Cosmos

### Table of Contents

[MAKING THE MEDIEVAL RELEVANT: HOW MEDIEVAL STUDIES CONTRIBUTE TO IMPROVING OUR UNDERSTANDING OF THE PRESENT](#) edited by Chris Jones, Conor Kostick and Klaus Oschema [Das Mittelalter. Perspektiven mediävistischer Forschung. Beihefte, De Gruyter, 9783110545302]

[TANG JUNYI: CONFUCIAN PHILOSOPHY AND THE CHALLENGE OF MODERNITY](#) by Thomas Fröhlich [Modern Chinese Philosophy, Brill, 9789004330146]

[THE GREEN SEA OF HEAVEN: FIFTY GHAZALS FROM THE DÍWÁN OF HÁFIZ](#) translated by Elizabeth T. Gray, Jr. with an Introduction by Daryush Shayegan [Library of Persian: Text and Contexts in Persian Religions and Spirituality, White Cloud Press, 9781883991067]

[LIGHT UPON LIGHT: ESSAYS IN ISLAMIC THOUGHT AND HISTORY IN HONOR OF GERHARD BOWERING](#) edited by Jamal J. Elias, Bilal Orfali [Islamic History and Civilization, Brill, 9789004409941]

[ESSAY: SUFISM AND ISLAMIC IDENTITY IN JALALUDDIN RUMI'S ANATOLIA](#) by Jamal J. Elias

[REIMAGINING SPIRIT: WIND, BREATH, AND VIBRATION](#) by Grace Ji-Sun Kim [Cascade Books, 9781532689253]

[GOETHE'S FAUST AND THE DIVAN OF HAFIZ: BODY AND SOUL IN PURSUIT OF KNOWLEDGE AND BEAUTY](#) by Hiwa Michaeli [De Gruyter, 9783110661569] open source

[EXERCISE OF POWER: AMERICAN FAILURES, SUCCESSES, AND A NEW PATH FORWARD IN THE POST-COLD WAR WORLD](#) by Robert M. Gates. [Alfred A. Knopf, 9781524731885] Other titles: [AMERICA AND THE POST-COLD WAR WORLD](#)

[SHAKESPEARE AND PROTESTANT POETICS](#) by Jason Gleckman [Palgrave Macmillan, 9789813295988]

[EXPLAINING THE COSMOS: CREATION AND CULTURAL INTERACTION IN LATE-ANTIQUA GAZA](#) by Michael W. Champion [Oxford Studies in Late Antiquity, Oxford University Press, 9780199337484]

[Bibliography](#)

### Editorial Appraisals:

Some qualified reviewers offer their own brief evaluation of the book. Otherwise most of our content represents the authors'-editors' own words as a preview to their approach to the subject, their style and point-of-view. <>

## **MAKING THE MEDIEVAL RELEVANT: HOW MEDIEVAL STUDIES CONTRIBUTE TO IMPROVING OUR UNDERSTANDING OF THE PRESENT** edited by Chris Jones, Conor Kostick and Klaus Oschema [Das Mittelalter. Perspektiven mediävistischer Forschung. Beihefte, De Gruyter, 9783110545302]

When scholars discuss the medieval past, the temptation is to become immersed there, to deepen our appreciation of the nuances of the medieval sources through debate about their meaning.

But the past informs the present in a myriad of ways and medievalists can, and should, use their research to address the concerns and interests of contemporary society. This volume presents a number of carefully commissioned essays that demonstrate the fertility and originality of recent work in Medieval Studies. Above all, they have been selected for relevance. Most contributors are in the earlier stages of their careers and their approaches clearly reflect how interdisciplinary methodologies applied to Medieval Studies have potential repercussions and value far beyond the boundaries of the Middle Ages. These chapters are powerful demonstrations of the value of medieval research to our own times, both in terms of providing answers to some of the specific questions facing humanity today and in terms of much broader considerations. Taken together, the research presented here also provides readers with confidence in the fact that Medieval Studies cannot be neglected without a great loss to the understanding of what it means to be human.

#### Contents

Chris Jones, Conor Kostick, and Klaus Oschema: Why Should we Care about the Middle Ages? Putting the Case for the Relevance of Studying Medieval Europe

#### Science

Tobias Kluge and Maximilian Schuh: Providing Reliable Data? Combining Scientific and Historical Perspectives on Flooding Events in Medieval and Early Modern Nuremberg (1400–1800)

Conor Kostick and Francis Ludlow: Medieval History, Explosive Volcanism, and the Geoengineering Debate

Jörg Feuchter: The Middle Ages in the Genetics Lab

Freya Harrison and Erin Connelly: Could Medieval Medicine Help the Fight Against Antimicrobial Resistance?

#### Education

Julien Demade: The Contemporary Delegitimization of (Medieval) History – and of the Traditional University Curriculum as a Whole

Chris Jones and Madi Williams: Pacific Perspectives: Why study Europe's Middle Ages in Aotearoa New Zealand?

Laura Grazia Di Stefano: How to be a Time Traveller: Exploring Venice with a Fifteenth-Century Pilgrimage Guide

#### Society

Klaus Oschema: Heaven Can Tell ... Late Medieval Astrologers as Experts – and what they can Teach us about Contemporary Financial Expertise  
 Elva Johnston: Eoin MacNeill's Early Medieval Ireland: A Scholarship for Politics or a Politics of Scholarship?  
 Hélène Sirantoine: What's in a Word? Naming 'Muslims' in Medieval Christian Iberia  
 Niamh Wycherley: The Enduring Power of the Cult of Relics – an Irish Perspective  
 Ben Jervis: Resilience and Society in Medieval Southampton: An Archaeological Approach to Anticipatory Action, Politics, and Economy  
 Reflections  
 Pierre Monnet: Studying the Middle Ages: Historical Food for Thought in the Present Day 277  
 Notes on Contributors  
 Index

## Essay: Studying the Middle Ages: Historical Food for Thought in the Present Day by Pierre Monnet

**Abstract:** Why study the Middle Ages? The answers this question yields concern more than simply medievalists: they generate reflections regarding the usefulness of science or intellectual engagement in any given society. Answering the question includes critical reflection on periodization in general and, in particular, on the public's understanding of what is termed (for better or worse) 'the Middle Ages'. The relevance of studying the period has been justified in many ways. It allows, for example, a comparison of social dynamics and the gathering of insights into the role of religion. Equally, it enables investigation of modes of rule and the organization of communities. Ultimately, it enables us to better understand modernity itself. Yet while many arguments concern a better understanding of the contemporary world, they do not necessarily justify the necessity of incorporating medieval comparisons. The current consensus (at least in French medieval studies) is to study the Middle Ages as a society in its own right. There is an additional understanding that the specific problems raised by this period should be placed in a broader chronological and spatial context. These critical reflections invite deeper considerations, which are, in turn, useful in developing our sense of democracy, our understanding of society, and in the development of a historical science that is conscious of the current tendencies to 're-politicize' history. This chapter argues that this leads to invaluable insights into the workings of any discipline concerned with the perception of time and change.

### Turning back – and broadening the question

To raise the question of the interest and relevance of studying and teaching the Middle Ages means, first, to presuppose that there should be debate on the matter and, secondly, that what we call 'the Middle Ages' constitutes a well-defined and clearly conceptualized subject. The simple affirmation that the Middle Ages 'exist' at all needs to be the starting point for any reflection that seeks to answer the question of whether studying the period constitutes either a 'useful' or 'useless' endeavour. Each of our initial assumptions, however, must be considered to be problematic. The difficulties they raise are closely intertwined. The twofold nature of the initial question, which appears to be simple only at the most superficial first glance, presupposes two assumptions that might in turn have dangerous or undesirable side-effects: firstly, that the Middle Ages 'exist' and, secondly, that the fact of their existence enables us to ask, in a meaningful way, whether studying them is either 'useful' or 'useless'.

The underlying logic of these initial assumptions and their consequences demand explicit elucidation, not least because the very label 'Middle Ages' derives from a specific understanding. Introduced by humanists in the sixteenth century, its inventors sought to discredit the entire period that came between the fall of Roman civilization and their own. The term has been repeated continually ever since.

Its success and persistent use up to our own day should in fact be considered surprising: it is a persistence that has survived shifts in chronology as well as the arrival of new chrononyms that flank the so-called 'Middle Ages' such as 'Renaissance' and 'Late Antiquity'.

My argument will focus first and foremost on phenomena that concern 'history' as an institutionalized academic discipline. There are two principle reasons that might lead scholars of the 'Middle Ages', a particular unit in the system of academic periodization of history, to try and justify the usefulness of studying the object of their specialization (and sometimes even to justify its very existence). In the first place, there is an intellectual and heuristic benefit: scrutinizing the very motivations that lead individuals to doubt either a period's existence or the usefulness of studying it helps us to clarify, in an interesting way, the relationship between modern and pre-modern periods and cultures. The so-called 'exoticism', 'strangeness', 'alterity', 'barbarism', 'intolerance', and 'violence' of the Middle Ages — to mention but a few of the highly charged notions that frequently appear and which are often invoked in trying the case of this allegedly dismal and backwards period — are more revealing about the prejudices and fantasies of our own times than about any specific moment of the past. And for this reason alone, the prejudice of the judges would suffice to legitimize studying the Middle Ages: study enables us to get a clearer idea of the distortions. In the second place, the arguments that are and can be mobilized in order to 'explain' the Middle Ages come under the heading of a reflexive epistemology that is always beneficial.

### The Problems of Time and Periodization

We can agree that for the above two reasons the medievalists' Middle Ages has no more need than any other period to defend itself; yet, by the same token, nor do specialists in this period have any more reason to evade the question than those working in other periods. The question raised at the beginning of this chapter is therefore directed to all periods and other demarcations of historical time which are fixed and rationalized a posteriori for academic, ideological, and institutional purposes. The question either has merit for all fields or for none. The simple explanation for this is that the relationship of our societies to time and history has changed. This is because the social need of history, as a discipline, has evolved. History itself — as science, practice, and writing — has changed (for starters, as a result of the internet). To make the 'non-present present', comprehensible, and in certain respects necessary, functions that both collide and coincide with the contemporaneity of the non-contemporary, is something that properly concerns the whole field of history or, to echo Marc Bloch, all processes of historical reflection and understanding that are connected to the modes of functioning and of the transformation of structures of a society. Applying this perspective actually makes History nothing less than the science of social change over time. And, as such, History can claim to be part of a broad range of 'pure' scientific endeavour, that is scientific activity that is not driven by the goal of obtaining profit. In this, as part of the Humanities and the Social Sciences, History is a science precisely because it is historical and thus focusses first and foremost on human actors, individual and collective. Taking into account a certain form of nostalgia and attachment to the past and the approaches imposed by certain media and the seductive nature of everything 'medieval' (real and imagined) for a wide range of different modern ideologies, we can understand why the Middle Ages, more than any other period, seem, at the end of the twentieth century and the beginning of the twenty-first, to be particularly vulnerable to dangerous ideological exploitation. The increasing importance of this exploitation is highlighted dramatically by the way in which the Middle Ages has recently changed its status from being a 'showcase' period to become a pleasantly exotic world. As such, it has been 're-imported' into the present day, where it has become part of political strategies that seek to use it as an ideological tool. This phenomenon is particularly apparent in situations where the Middle Ages are introduced as the matrix of a western, Christian civilization, which is purportedly simultaneously 'under attack' by Muslim

fundamentalism while at the same time endangered by processes of globalization. The latter are in turn interpreted as the death of the nation-state and the end of Europe's special character and exceptional nature. In this sense, the prominent exploitation of the Middle Ages as an ideological resource - a practice that can conveniently be called 'medievalism' - reveals that the problems that might induce a critical debate of medieval history's value and the status of medieval studies, are part and parcel of a democratic crisis, a crisis that affects the loss of our contemporary sense of political meaning. The methods and research principles of medievalists themselves, on the other hand, have less to do with current issues.

Specialists of this period, historians whose chronological framework has become very flexible and might in fact be considered to cover the entire time between the end of Antiquity and the turn of the nineteenth century, are confronted with a series of dramatic developments: the globalization of history and the new subjects it introduces (including prominent and ubiquitous calls to 'de-Europeanize' history), the overwhelming domination of contemporary history (which goes hand in hand with a regime of historicity marked by the domination of presentism),<sup>9</sup> an increasing social demand – something, as I noted above, that is increasingly exploited and used as a political instrument – addressed to the entire body of historians in the context of public and patrimonial debates over sites of memory, and, no less significantly, the major thematic and methodologic reorientations in the study of medieval society that have occurred in recent decades. Like it or not, specialists have recently engaged in, voluntarily or involuntarily, a self-reflective exercise concerning their approach to, and the object of, their knowledge. This is obviously a development that should be welcomed.

## How to use a Social Science

From the guild of medievalists themselves came a series of rather cautious reassessments. These remained strictly historiographical and methodological, and were primarily addressed to other professional or academic historians. Beyond these, several attempts have been made to respond to the question of the necessity and relevance of the study of the Middle Ages – or, at the very least, a certain understanding of the medieval – not only in academia but in society in general. Many of these latter, with a readership that stretches beyond a narrow circle of colleagues and specialists in mind, have tried consciously to demonstrate the usefulness of the Middle Ages by underlining their contemporary relevance.

Numerous other attempts have tried to locate an argument for relevance on the general scientific and cultural specificity of the subject or the terrain called the Middle Ages. In this regard, one might cite Johannes Fried's book, which justifies the relevance of the Middle Ages for the present by highlighting the existence of a medieval 'knowledge society' that cultivated the intrinsic unity of all fields of knowledge. According to Fried, it was this particular structure, which represents the complete opposite of the present day with its fragmentation of the sciences, different fields of knowledge, and perspectives, that actually gave birth to modern 'knowledge' and science. Jérôme Baschet's study of the global social dynamic of the Middle Ages within the paradigm of the ecclesio-feudal order—that is, a style of domination characterized by a logic of service and salvation which controls and dominates through a new combination of the spiritual and the corporeal—proceeds in a different mode but in a similar spirit. Baschet analyses the cultural techniques that were deployed to command nature, the historicization of time, and Christian universalism. In so doing, he underlines how all these elements combine and simultaneously become the condition and the legacy of the West in its initiatives of colonial conquest.

In both the above instances we might note that the exposition is not placed under any heading that involves the 'usefulness' of the Middle Ages as defined by the period's capacity to explain the present

day. This distinguishes both approaches from the multitude of other works which usually do just that. One example of the latter done in a particularly bad way concerns the 'crusades' and 'holy war' in cases where authors assess both in the context of a supposed clash of civilizations and religion between the Christian West and Islam. Instead of proposing analogies that are as easy to draw as they are erroneous, Fried and Baschet underline the necessity of taking into account the specificities and dynamics of the Middle Ages in order to understand with precision, by comparison or imitation —and in Baschet's case by creation and rupture —why our present has become what it is and why it maintains a troubled relationship with the Middle Ages in particular. This is a relationship that the late Otto Gerhard Oexle described as a cleft or a split. More recently, a collection of essays has attempted to move beyond the simple justification of studying the Middle Ages by way of underlining their relationship to the present.

Here the period is understood as the 'object' of scientific scrutiny. These scholars have tried to rehabilitate the Middle Ages' epistemological and heuristic status as an indispensable link in a long-term social dynamic in the West, one which cannot be ignored if we want to understand the latter's development. This allows us to speak of the study of this period in terms of real 'necessity'. In the course of a longterm development that unfolds from the fifth to the eighteenth century, the relationships between individuals, family/kin, space, and religion were fundamentally restructured in comparison with what preceded and what followed. In this sense the authors of this collective work respond to the question of 'why study the Middle Ages' not primarily by exploring 'how' (practices, writing, sources, etc.) or with a 'because' answer. Rather, they claim, and wholeheartedly embrace, the idea that 'medieval history' should have the status of an Historical Science. Its practice can tell us much about the relationship between History and the Social Sciences, between past and present, and about the fundamental structural elements of a complex human society. On the basis of this approach, the term 'Middle Ages' can be replaced by 'medieval society'.

If one wanted to summarize a 'French' voice — if such a thing even exists (and it has to legitimize itself by way of comparison with other historiographical traditions in Europe) — in a debate that seeks to elucidate the reasons one might put forward in order to argue in favour of the legitimacy and necessity of the study of the Middle Ages, we might identify a set of characteristics. Since this chapter seeks to retain the experimental nature that underlies the entire present volume, I will briefly discuss these reasons in an approach that combines critique and comparison.

## Some Suggestions

These characteristics notably include:

1. the persistent but nevertheless not always accepted recognition that we still do not really know how to work in a comparative way, that is between countries, periods, etc.,
2. the belief that history remains an entity that consists of a chronological unit, of a fixed set of concepts, and tools,
3. the precocious integration, by the Annales School, of anthropological and sociological issues (analysing and understanding 'the social' by all available methods, in other words: treating the Middle Ages as a 'laboratory'),
4. the status of historical science (including the medieval period), which is secured through the structures that ensure the training of elites for the (French) Republic and which, in turn, stress the study of history as a project of national identity and as an instrument of democratic acculturation, and
5. the general integration of History as a discipline and as a general way of thinking in an ideological field that can be characterized as progressive rather than conservative. This leads, to put it



briefly, to an interpretation of the long-term process that some have chosen to call 'European exceptionalism' or 'divergence' as the original model. It would thus constitute a non-replicable and nonreproducible model of the organization of parental, spatial, and economic links in the service of a specific social and cultural constellation that was, from an anthropological perspective, based on domination over people and land. The links in question would include the types of resource use, remunerated labour, levies on a free but controlled peasantry, household autonomy, urbanization, organization of the monotheist sacred in the dimension of space, monetarization of the economy without monetarization of economic decision-making, articulation of body and spirit based on a specific relationship between culture and nature, and the historicization of time.

### 'De-medievalizing' the Problem

In order to answer the question of whether a historical science devoted to the Middle Ages is relevant we should avoid arguing on a purely ontological level, even if this dimension can still play a role, by affirming that 'the study of the Middle Ages is essential because the Middle Ages exist'. Nor can the answer be teleological; Marc Bloch would have spoken of the "idol of origins", meaning either a period for which one feels nostalgia for a lost time or an era from which Europe did well to free itself through rejection. Finally, we cannot rely exclusively on the argument that studying the Middle Ages contributes to a better understanding of our own present and its phenomena of stratification, its relationship to the religious, or its specific construction of politics and identity. After all, one suspects it is not so much the content of each of these positions that is important today, but rather their combination, their public and academic implications, and their integration into a scientific project that is conscious of the triple specificity and the triple historicity of its objects, its methodology, and its subjects. This project must be attentive to the profound changes that affect the study of history and that arise from the questions that historians choose to ask, but also to history's uses, its techniques (notably the widespread electronic access to sources and the online publication of research results), and its public. For there exist multiple 'Middle Ages', not only in the sense of an historiography, of a period, of a professional discipline, of a specific critical methodology that governs the handling and interpretation of the sources, and of a narrative, but also in the sense of concepts, of a teaching method, and of the uses of the past. These plural, parallel, and competing definitions, carry within themselves one or more contradictions whose very unmasking is actually part and parcel of the definition of the subject and therefore its legitimacy. Politicians and the media, to the contrary, would rather that we seek the best ways to essentialize history and to arrange it in a streamlined narrative.

How should we react to these multiple and ideologically motivated expectations? On a very first level, our argument should be based on the assumption that historical knowledge is indivisible (if not unique). Otherwise, we risk reviving internal divisions between the different periods and the academics who represent them, and thereby elevating the importance of one period over another. If we take the initial assertion seriously, it will inevitably lead to the conviction that medievalists possess a wide and open field of enquiry that they can cultivate at the crossroads of Anthropology, the Humanities, and Social Sciences, while their work remains organized around the fundamental need to understand the social production of change in a given period. In order to plead in favour of the relevance of the Middle Ages, a second argument might be added, which fundamentally relies on the unity of the problems that are raised by the observation of history or asked by historians. This unity exists no matter what the individual research question is, whether we work on the history of women, of the individual, of power, of coercion, of rituals, and so on. In all these cases, serious research can never focus exclusively on the Middle Ages, yet it cannot afford to ignore the period either!

Once this preliminary framework is established, the problem of the relevance of medieval studies encourages us to revisit the question of what we might call 'secondary' characteristics of the period. Which elements make the Middle Ages specific and unique, so that the period can neither be merged with another nor exchanged with it, whether that other is its predecessor or successor? In addition, we might ask which mental and structural patterns were characteristic of the Middle Ages and its organization of the social field.

### Changing the Vocabulary

Asking these questions and discussing the answers can have two results. Firstly, it might lead us to rename the 'Middle Ages'. Rather, we might start to talk about 'medieval society', as, for example, Joseph Morsel has proposed. Morsel systematically argues for a label that invites attention to a double orientation, temporal and social. Secondly, we might begin to realize that what we collectively refer to as the 'Middle Ages' represents nothing more (but also nothing less) than the only period in history that is complete, (more or less clearly) delimited, and documented, and which enables us to observe the beginning and the end of a unique and original social process. This process is characterized by specific parameters that involve the place of religious institutions, the mode of production and work, and the organization of political powers, to name but the most obvious. Thus, the real question is, whether the Middle Ages are 'relevant' because of the specific way in which medievalists analyse medieval society — and because of the relationship between this approach to (or its integration into) a broader practice of understanding change that emanates from the Social Sciences.

In other words, if the 'house of the Middle Ages' is on fire and medievalists are 'firefighters' who may either save it or bury its remains, the cause of the flames themselves lies in reasons that far surpass any intrinsic quality ascribed to the period. Instead, their true origins concern our more general relationship to the past: they include the social demands which confront historians in the twenty-first century, demands that differ from those that faced their nineteenth-century counterparts at a time when History was first constituted as an academic and scientific discipline. The status of the humanities —and more broadly, of the intellectual —has changed in a society that has become addicted to the instant and to technology. Finally, global systems of values and representations have changed.

### A Central Question: What do we Lose and What do we Gain?

In view of all of these points, the relevance of the Middle Ages must be reconsidered not despite but because of these new factors and the environment they create. That relevance must be rethought as part of an intellectual exercise and therefore of an activity that wholeheartedly acknowledges its ideological character. In fact, from this perspective, nothing could be worse than a renewal of scholarly demand for autonomy and learned isolation. The meaning of this exercise is not at its core attached to a chronology composed of dates (for example 410—1492, from the 'fall' of Rome to the 'discovery' of America). Instead, it is rather generated by the questions it brings forth and by the problems it focusses on. The questions concern a subject that occupies a specific place in space and time and whose development was characterized by accidents. This latter should be underlined against all attempts to create erroneous continuities and teleological interpretations. The problems cannot be boiled down to the deadly triptych of 'altérité, identité, européenité' —alterity, identity, and 'Europeanness'. From this perspective the real focus of our reflections about the relevance of the Middle Ages should lie in considering the question of the added scientific value of medieval studies in relation to other historical and social projects: What do we lose and what do we gain if we either ignore or try to understand ten to fifteen centuries of history? How do the processes of identification and separation between the Middle Ages and ourselves play out today? How can we argue for the usefulness and relevance of the



Middle Ages without falling into the tyranny of a utilitarian discourse that unconsciously condemns medievalists to navigate exclusively between the poles of continuity and alterity?

On the whole, there is obviously no inherent or overarching obligation to study the Middle Ages. The only exception to that statement might be professional medievalists themselves, who do have an immediate (and very material) interest in saving either jobs that are threatened by budget-cuts or certain budgetary elements in specific contexts and institutions. Today, medievalists are in fact confronted with criticism or at least with questions that are addressed to their community as a whole and that concern their subject of study. The very existence of this criticism and of these questions should be reason enough to pause and to listen – we should neither challenge nor dismiss the concerns raised and the underlying motivations connected with them out of hand. Instead, our real concern should be to try and find, together, the reasons why the observation of a world that has disappeared furnishes helpful ‘food for thought’ in our present. We should work this out in cooperation, while practising history as a Social Science and as a Cultural Science. The world of the Middle Ages has all but disappeared entirely. Yet the period actually imposes itself on us because it represents at least ten centuries of spatial and social transformation that spans an entire continent. And it furnishes ‘food for thought’ because it strengthens our sense of history, our sense of democracy, our understanding of society, which is inevitably multiple and complex in nature. But all of this is only true as long we continue to approach the Middle Ages as an historical science that is conscious of the repoliticization of history, of its imperative for self-reflection, of the common interests it shares with other disciplines and of approaches to the perception of time and change. <>

## **TANG JUNYI: CONFUCIAN PHILOSOPHY AND THE CHALLENGE OF MODERNITY** by Thomas Fröhlich [Modern Chinese Philosophy, Brill, 9789004330146]

Tang Junyi's modern Confucianism ranks among the most ambitious philosophical projects in 20th century China. In **TANG JUNYI: CONFUCIAN PHILOSOPHY AND THE CHALLENGE OF MODERNITY**, Thomas Fröhlich examines Tang Junyi's intellectual reaction to a time of cataclysmic change marked by two Chinese revolutions (1911 and 1949), two world wars, the Cold War period, rapid modernization in East Asia, and the experience of exile.

The present study fundamentally questions widespread interpretations that depict modern Confucianism as essentially traditionalist and nationalistic. Thomas Fröhlich shows that Tang Junyi actually challenges such interpretations with an insightful understanding of the modern individual's vulnerability, as well as a groundbreaking reinterpretation of Confucianism as the civil-theological foundation for liberal democracy in China.

### **Review**

"Fröhlich...situates Tang in a discursive environment that includes many prominent figures of Western intellectual history and also materials from the late nineteenth and early twentieth century that were of direct impact. The book is written for and will be welcomed by everyone who takes an interest in China's recent history."

-Barbara Hendrichske, *University of Sydney*, in *Religious Studies Review*, Vol.44 No.4, (2018)

"Fröhlich's study is quite simply the best book on Tang Junyi out there, and one of the most sophisticated and rewarding investigations into Chinese intellectual history in general."

-Ady Van den Stock in *Monumenta Serica*, 67:1, 284-289.

## Contents

### Preface and Acknowledgments

#### 1 Tang Junyi's Intellectual Endeavor

##### A Journey into a Broken World

##### The Vantage Point of Modern Confucianism

##### The Watershed of 1949

#### 2 Critical Issues in Research on Modern Confucianism

##### Stereotypes and Omissions

##### Coherence and Comparison

#### 3 Common Perspectives on Tang Junyi's Thought

##### Conservatism

##### Neo-Confucianism

##### Humanism and Religiosity

##### Dogmatism

#### 4 Exile, Modernity, and Cultural Patriotism

##### The Convergence between Exile and Modernity

##### Exile as Horror Vacui

##### Intellectual Ethos and Messianic Vision

##### Nation and Culture

##### Cultural Patriotism

##### Defending Authenticity

#### 5 The Theological Accentuation

##### Theological Foundations

##### The Taxonomy of Knowledge and Intuition

##### Limits of Philosophical Exposition

##### The Limit-Concepts of "Philosophical Faith"

#### 6 The Moral Vision

##### Moral Intuitionism

##### Struggling with "Self-Cultivation"

##### Outlines of a Confucian Ethos

#### 7 Shifting the Foundations of Confucian Political Thought The Political and Its Demonic

##### Aspects Introspection in the Will for Power

##### The Moral Dimension of the Political Will

#### 8 On Statehood

##### Failed Statehood in China

##### The State and Individual Self-Fulfillment

##### State and Society

##### The World Order of "Ecumenical States"

#### 9 Anticipating Democracy

##### "Confucian Democracy": Dead Ends and Alternatives

##### The Weakness of Democracy in China

##### The Civil-Theological Justification of Democracy

##### Humanistic Culture and Democracy

#### 10 Civil Religion on a Confucian Basis Civil Religion for a Future China Political Ideals and Reality

#### 11 Coming to Terms with History

Modernity and Agency  
 History and Normativity  
 Signs of Progress  
 Delimiting a “Philosophy of History”  
 12 In Lieu of a Conclusion: The Totalitarian Challenge  
 On the Origins and Causes of Totalitarianism Overcoming Totalitarianism?  
 Appendix: Biographical Survey  
 Bibliography  
 Index

Excerpt: The present book on Tang Junyi attempts to make his work accessible for contemporary philosophy and intellectual history. Although I have interpreted Tang’s works as an intellectual historian, I endeavor here to do more than think about him. I also think with Tang and, consequently, at times go beyond him.

It is admittedly not the case that all of Tang’s oeuvre equally deserves contemporary philosophy’s undivided attention. Indeed, some parts are best left to intellectual historians. Their examination can deepen our historical understanding of modern Confucianism, without necessarily having immediate relevance for current discussions in international philosophy or political theory. Other parts, however, undoubtedly offer stimulating insights with respect to ongoing discourses, for example on modernity, in these disciplines.

The scope of the subject matter covered by Tang’s philosophy is vast. Readers can thus follow their own interests by perusing specific chapters. For those with little interest in political ideas and historical thinking, Chapters 8 to 12 are of secondary importance. As regards the first three chapters, and Chapters 5 and 6, they offer an examination of the historical and intellectual contexts of Tang’s Confucianism, as well as an analysis of the civil-theological framework, which is crucial for understanding his philosophical undertaking. Chapter 7 should also be of interest for those readers who do not normally study political philosophy. It shows how profoundly Tang’s thought differs from common, often uninspiring interpretations of Confucianism and its idea of man. In the same vein, Chapter 4 is meant to correct the impression that Confucians of the 20th century mostly contented themselves with defending “Chinese culture” and fighting cultural battles against Western influence. The fact that Tang was more concerned with general problems of modern life and exile is one of the reasons why his work rewards careful study.

Finally, it is not my aim to reconstruct Tang Junyi’s philosophy as a closed system free from inner contradictions. This would inevitably lead to omissions and misrepresentations of certain parts of his work. Nor do I wish to present a hermetic exegesis of his writings that would have little more to offer than a straightforward reading of his texts.

Research on the present work began more than fifteen years ago. Some parts have been published, in earlier versions, as articles in journals and collective volumes. Chapter 4 is based on my “The Exilic Prism of Modernity: New Perspectives on the Post-War Philosophy of Tang Junyi;” Chapters 7 and 8 contain some revised passages from “Tang Junyi, Max Weber und die Mächte des Dämonischen. Zum Politikverständnis eines modernen Konfuzianers,” and “Tang Junyi und die konfuzianische Erneuerung des chinesischen Staates;” Chapter 9 entails revised passages of “‘Confucian Democracy’ and its Confucian Critics: Mou Zongsan and Tang Junyi on the Limits of Confucianism;” Chapters 11 and 12 contain parts of “The Challenge of Totalitarianism: Lessons from Tang Junyi’s Political Philosophy.”

## Tang Junyi's Intellectual Endeavor: A Journey into a Broken World

Tang Junyi conveyed a vivid impression of the huge distance between the Sichuan of his youth and the modernizing Hong Kong of the late 1960s in an interview that he gave to a student journal two decades after his emigration to Hong Kong in 1949. He revealed that his interest had been piqued by the American hippie movement after watching a documentary about Woodstock in a movie theater in Hong Kong. His comments are particularly illuminating not only because they highlight his extensive intellectual journey, but also his liberal mindset. For instance, he indicated his fascination with the fact that the hippies practiced a passive form of social protest, albeit without a clear objective. While he sympathized with the hippies, he critically observed that they had no adequate form of expressing their opinions or their longing for individuality. They also had no real idea of how to proceed. At most, they seemed only able to engage in a form of protest that was specifically linked to their clothing and hair style. Tang believed that they ultimately did not know how to positively change the external world and thus resorted to transforming their own internal realities—their feelings—through another form of protest, namely, by taking drugs. While he was convinced that hippies lacked “inner peace” and individual strength, he also recognized that their music appealed to audiences despite its sense of despair and restlessness. What is more, even though he disclosed his conservative sexual morality in diagnosing an “indulgence in sexual life” in Europe and America (believing it to be a sign of the “degeneration of Western culture”), he still refrained from condemning the hippie movement altogether.

Woodstock might seem far removed for a Chinese philosopher who was born in suburban Southwestern Sichuan on January 17, 1909, four days before the reign of the second to last emperor of the Qing Dynasty, the Guangxu-Emperor, had officially ended. At that time, the Chinese state was rapidly disintegrating, and many parts of the country were caught in the grip of tumultuous political, social, and intellectual change. Tang not only lived through these events and the upheavals of the following decades, but he felt compelled to make sense of them. His philosophical oeuvre, which reflects this endeavor, is marked by many achievements and failures, along with some surprises. Tang was one of modern China's most prolific thinkers. He relentlessly produced his lifework, which spans a remarkable range of intellectual concerns, over the course of half a century. His life indeed seems to be characterized by a persistent effort to keep pace intellectually with an age of unprecedented cataclysms and recurrent political and social turmoil in China and the world.

Tang's statements about the hippie movement are also remarkable because they reveal his open-mindedness toward social phenomena that must have been unsettling to a tradition-conscious thinker. Tang himself would have referred to his intellectual and personal attitude as “humanistic,” but it might also be called “liberal.” Liu Shu-hsien aptly sums up this attitude when he writes that “[f]or Tang everyone has to find the best for himself in the context given.” This liberal mindset was certainly prone to ambiguity, for while Tang upheld a culturally conservative world view, he was also convinced that a rigid insistence on traditional orders of political and moral values was untenable for modernizing societies. As a result, his reflection on modernity was largely free from schematic distinctions between (Chinese) tradition and (Western) modernity.

Tang maintained his liberal outlook in the face of hostile political tendencies and historical turmoil. The most severe disruption in his life came in 1949, when he left the Chinese Mainland for good. At the time he immigrated to Hong Kong, his life had probably not been in immediate danger, nor did Chinese communism likely pose a personal threat to him. Indeed, he had never publicly criticized the communists before his years in exile. This would change almost immediately after his arrival in Hong Kong. In the context of the Cold War period, he began to equate communist rule on the Chinese Mainland with

totalitarianism, which, for him, was inextricably linked to modernity (see Chap. 12). Other aspects of modernity appeared on Tang's philosophical agenda as well which were no less threatening to him. His reflection on the exilic experience was, above all, closely intertwined with a perceptive observation of modernity's downsides. These included the experience of the individual's cultural alienation, social isolation, and intellectual marginalization. Tang once remarked that the contemporary situation of the exiled Chinese is characterized by the fact that their "motherland has been destroyed and [their] home lost"—that their hopes for their lives and educational ideals now "loom in the emptiness," and they therefore "roam around" and are "carried by the wind." In fact, Tang conceptualized the exilic experience as a sort of prism through which one could not only grasp the nature of modernity, but also conceive of ways to cope with it. This interweaving of exile and modernity informs his reflection on the identity and stability of the individual self in modern society (see Chap. 4).

At the interface between exile and modernity, Tang also pondered the aggressive colonization of human societies by hegemonic forms of instrumental rationality and an ensuing reification of social and cultural relations. This led to his diagnosis of the global unfolding of an instrumental type of modernization that was posing a lethal threat to the remnants of intellectual traditions and established ways of life. In the wake of the communist takeover on the Chinese Mainland, he described this threat at times in a dramatic way, detecting initial signs of a withering away of China's humanistic culture. However, he insisted that a wholesale rejection of modernity was not feasible, and he was keenly aware of the dangerous implications of ideologies that promised fundamental solutions to the modern malaise. He also did not opt for a "Chinese" solution, for he knew that many emancipatory facets of political modernity—among them constitutional government, human rights, the rule of law, and democracy—had Western, not Chinese origins. The same could be said, by and large, of the dynamic process of industrialization and scientific technological development. Significantly, Tang never subscribed to the type of historical speculation that predicted the emergence of a superior, predominantly "Chinese" form of modernity. Liang Shuming 梁漱溟 (1893–1988) had done this in his widely popular book *Eastern and Western Cultures and Their Philosophies* (Dong Xi wenhua ji qi zhexue) from 1921. On the contrary, Tang was convinced that modern societies were irremediably broken to the point where no single, comprehensive doctrine could adequately respond to their inherently ambiguous life-worlds.

Yet Tang was still convinced that members of modern societies needed to maintain, at least in some measure, an affirmative identification with cultural life in order to instill meaning into their own ways of life—even if existing conditions were in turmoil and the given cultural contexts on the brink of disintegration. Otherwise, neither individuals nor collectivities would be able to uphold an authentic self-reassurance. Indeed, authenticity was one of Tang's major concerns. Under the condition of an irretrievably alienating modernization, an effort of normative "reconstruction" was necessary since authenticity could no longer be understood as a historically given condition. Yet he disagreed with the reactionary forces that propagated a return to imperial political and cultural traditions, a tendency which culminated under the dictatorial rule of Yuan Shikai in the mid-1910s. Tang's stance was also critical toward the so-called movement for a "New Culture," which began at around the same time. He was highly skeptical about the tendency of "New Culture" proponents to subject the modern plurality of Chinese life-worlds to totalistic forms of scientism. Despite these misgivings, his opposition to the movement remained limited to the intellectual sphere. The political goal of democracy, on the other hand, was not contested by the New Culture Movement or Tang's modern Confucianism, nor was the basic understanding that the introduction of modern science to China was indispensable.

Overall, Tang's diagnosis of Chinese modernity was bleak. This was especially true with regard to China's prolonged failure in catching up with Western nation-states economically, and its inability to establish a robust democratic republic after 1911. Reflecting on China's historical course, Tang faced the uneasy reality that, except for the communist revolution of 1949, every other political revolution and use of military force had largely failed to produce any political and social stability. He thus drew the following fundamental lesson from China's continuous failure to establish a new and stable type of political order: Any attempt to implement a totalistic, substantial reintegration of modern society would inevitably come at the cost of traditionalism, dogmatism, authoritarianism, or even totalitarianism. What had to be acknowledged instead was the insight that the justification of institutions, procedures and norms of collective life could no longer rest on claims to a higher, "sacred" truth. Tang was thus well aware of the fact that in global modernity there were both emancipative currents and an ever-looming tendency toward the opposite, namely the totalistic reification of the human beings and their life-worlds. In Tang's view, modern subjects were indeed in danger of falling victim to their own rebellion against the fetters of traditional societies and ideas. This paradox marks the point of departure for his project to reconstruct Confucianism. It is therefore more to the point to address this reconstruction as "modern" rather than simply as "new." In fact, Tang hardly ever used the now common label of "new Confucianism" (xin ruxue / xin rujia). The designation "modern" is also apt because Tang's project is consistent with key ideas of the Western philosophical criticism of modernity raised during the 20th century—whether in the context of philosophies of life, existentialism, philosophical anthropology, or political philosophy.

Tang occasionally termed his philosophical project "humanistic" and contended that Chinese humanism would need to "expand" in the future to attain the position of a "world humanism." The humanistic concern of thinking through modernity entails, first of all, the quest for a "moral self," i.e. a realization of man's "moral nature." Here, Tang harkened back to Confucian speculations about the individual's access to the inner moral truth of human nature. In the 20th century, these speculations had to be critically reassessed under specifically modern conditions. Tang consequently eliminated from his Confucian agenda the vain hope of overcoming the downsides of modernity by making an appeal to individuals to engage in ethical "self-cultivation." An uncritical belief in self-cultivation would make the individual highly susceptible to Weltanschauungen (world views) and political ideologies that proclaim the omnipotence of an ethical will in the realm of politics. Yet the historical course of modernity, according to Tang, is not to be misunderstood as a process of inner-worldly salvation leading to the ethical realization of the good in human society.

Tang was equally skeptical towards reflections on modernity that simply adopt the "Western" perspective, no matter whether they are presented in the fields of social science, philosophy, or social criticism. But his skepticism did not prevent him from conceptualizing modernization as a globally ongoing process characterized by the gradual evolution of traits typically associated with contemporary Western societies. He assumed that over the long run functional and institutional differentiations of spheres of action which were observable in Western societies would emerge on a global scale. This pertained, in particular, to the division of labor in industrial society, and, above all, to the division of spheres of law and morality. Indeed, this assumption is critical to Tang's universalistic concept of modernity-as-modernization. It forms the basis for his claim that modernization will produce the political form of a constitutional democracy, together with an industrial society. Yet Tang did not ignore particular historical conditions and intellectual traditions—such as those in China—which could shape modernity in different parts of the world. On the contrary, in reconsidering China's intellectual traditions in the broad sense, he fought against what he perceived to be manifestations of a "Western"



colonial hegemony or even cultural imperialism in the spheres of education, science, the liberal arts, and public debate. A number of Tang's writings from the exile period bear witness to his crusade, as does his affirmative, pan-Asian depiction of post-war Japan as a model for preserving indigenous intellectual and material culture under conditions of rapid modernization (see Chap. 4).

Since the early decades of the 20th century, there have been debates both inside and outside of China about Confucian alternatives to Western models of modernization. In many respects, however, the discussions have reached an impasse: Whereas some observers tend to depict Confucianism as a panacea for all kinds of political and social ills in East Asian and Western societies, others consider it to be a mere vestige of imperial China that lacks any relevance for contemporary discourse on modernity. Tang Junyi's modern Confucianism proposes a way to overcome this impasse by combining a critical reinterpretation of Confucian thought with a careful assessment of achievements and failures in modern societies. Not only does an in-depth analysis of his project inspire a critical reexamination of key issues in contemporary Confucian discourse such as "Confucian democracy," but it is also highly conducive for the discussion of issues that are critical to our understanding of modern China and Confucianism. Among these we find an ever-present concern in modern Chinese philosophy and politics, namely the question of how to conceptualize the relationship between new "Western" types of political order and indigenous intellectual traditions. Equally significant, Tang's philosophy yields a thought-provoking approach to understanding the individual's vulnerability in the context of rapidly modernizing East Asian societies. What is more, by reflecting on exile—an experience with which he was intimately familiar and which marked the lives of many people worldwide in the 20th century—Tang presents a novel perspective on the modern malaise. Here, as well as in other respects, Tang's own refusal to "Orientalize" his thinking is crucial, because it opens it up to broader philosophical debates.

### The Vantage Point of Modern Confucianism

To grasp the originality, but also the ambivalence of Tang's modern Confucianism, discussion should not be limited to his moral reflection, religious thought, and academic philosophy. In the framework of Tang's thought, it is indispensable to uncover the relation between moral, political, and religious concerns. Toward this end, one may discern three major stages in his philosophical lifework, which spanned a period of almost five decades. Prior to his years in exile, which began in 1949, he wrote two monographs dealing with topics of moral philosophy and philosophy of life. He also published a considerable number of articles on Chinese philosophy, art and literature, Western philosophy, and contemporary political and social issues. In the second stage, from the late 1940s to the early 1960s, Tang concentrated on political philosophy, moral philosophy, philosophy of history, and Chinese humanism, while also developing the theological-metaphysical framework of his Confucianism. In addition, he addressed a wide range of issues in politics, society, and cultural life. Though he did not comment on contemporary issues as much as Xu Fuguan (1903–1982) or Zhang Junmai (1886–1969), he continuously engaged in current affairs well into the 1970s by writing articles and giving interviews. The third stage can be roughly dated from the mid-1960s onwards until the end of Tang's life, when he devoted most of his time to an extensive academic study of Chinese philosophy and a comprehensive metaphysical speculation about the spiritual and moral dimensions of human life.

It was during the middle period that Tang developed his understanding of modern Confucianism in terms of political thought. This effort rested on his conviction that the course of modernity might be influenced by those afflicted by it, even though modern societies appeared to organize collective life hermetically. For Tang, there was still room for normative reflection and practical interventions in the

modern world, provided that individuals were able to attain a thorough understanding of the process of modernity. The modern world, in other words, was still a political reality.

Most interpreters exclusively apply the label “philosophy” to Tang’s work, without addressing its framework as “theological.” However, Tang systematically developed the notions of “Confucian religiosity” to a degree that justifies the use of the label “theological” in this context. Some scholars actually qualify Tang’s “philosophy” by highlighting the religious aspects of his thought. Shun Kai Kevin Cheng, for example, concludes that “[t]his (i.e. Tang’s philosophy—TF) can be considered as a fully incarnational philosophy where the decree of Heaven is fully incarnated within the nature of each and every human being.” It goes without saying that the word “theology” is used in the present study in the broad sense of the word. This is common nowadays in encyclopedias of theology, with “theology” in the narrow sense denoting the monotheistic religions. When Tang outlined the theological framework of modern Confucianism in the late 1940s and 1950s, he may have felt that the term “theology” (shenxue 神學) was linked too closely to Christian theology. Be that as it may, he conceived of an inclusive concept of philosophy to absorb theological-metaphysical elements, referring to this framework variously as “philosophical,” “metaphysical,” or “religious.”

Tang summarized the far-reaching infusion of modern Confucianism with theological elements as a “philosophical faith” (zhexue de xinyang 哲學的 信仰) (see Chap. 5). His project is therefore “modern,” not only in the sense of a philosophical reaction to the global impact of modernity, but also in a much more ambitious sense insofar as it aims to delineate a philosophical/theological foundation of social modernity in (a future) China. To be sure, Tang recognized the secularized, “disenchanted” form of modernity. Nonetheless, he still identified modernity as the historical stage at which Confucian ideas of individual self-fulfillment, and hence freedom, can be realized to an unprecedented degree. In effect, he maintained that modern forms of collective life are to be understood as preconditions for the individual’s striving for self-realization. Faced with socioeconomic, political, and cultural alienation, individuals can, according to a Hegelian figure in Tang’s thought, overcome (aufheben) the antithesis between their goal of self-fulfillment and the “outer” forms of alienation. In order to come to terms with the modern experience of alienation, they must analyze its historical formation and then discern how alienation and emancipation are interrelated. This very reflection is to be seen as an endeavor that actually befits the individual’s self-fulfillment. The latter does not require, if we are to follow Tang, a comprehensive remediation of alienation in modernity, nor should it be understood as a purely theoretical endeavor. Rather, Tang proposes to closely interweave normative reflection on the modern world and the quest for individual self-fulfillment. In this vein, Tang conceptualizes “inner sagehood” as the human being’s immediate realization of the absolute or “Heaven” (tian 天). As Tang claims, the communion with “Heaven” instantaneously lifts the individual’s mind above its own limits. This ephemeral state of mind involves the cognitive act of “innate knowing” (liang zhi 良知), whereby the human mind gains intuitive access to the highest truth or principle. This is the broad perspective of Tang’s tenacious effort to reconstruct modern subjectivity on the basis of a Confucian civil theology. He accordingly linked the notion of self-fulfillment with certain Confucian traditions and categorized it as a Confucian type of “religiosity” (zongjiaoxing 宗教性) (see Chap. 5). Besides, Tang’s civil-theological understanding of “innate knowing” is clearly set apart from reinterpretations of “innate knowing” from the Republican period. He indeed refrained from harkening back to these earlier reinterpretations and their critics.

With the new conceptualization of Confucian religiosity, Tang's civil theology dissociates itself from the politico-religious tradition of Confucian cults in the late imperial period and from ill-fated attempts to install a Confucian state religion in early republican China. What it shares with the ideas of proponents of a Confucian state religion, such as Chen Huanzhang (1880–1933), Yan Fu, or Liang Qichao (1873–1929) who were active in the years 1912 and 1913, is the intention to tie “Confucianism” to the normative foundations of the republic. Yet Tang's notion of Confucian religiosity did not lend itself to a concept of republican “state religion” (*guo jiao*) that tended to contradict the constitutional principle of religious freedom. It also was neither amenable to a religious reverence of the figure of Confucius (as in “Kong jiao” SLC), nor, finally, to a dogmatism that hypostatized Confucianism as an authoritative religious teaching (as in “Ru jiao”).

In fact, Tang did not assume that the truth of moral intuition (*liang zhi*) could be institutionalized, either in terms of religion or politics. He instead endorsed a view that highlights the religious and political elusiveness of absolute truth claims based on intuition. Due to this rejection of dogmatism, Tang's civil theology accords with the transcendental type of civil theology. “Transcendental” refers to the conviction that “secular ends can never really become sacred.” The sacred, accordingly, is not considered to be substantially immanent to particular politico-religious institutions and practices. David Apter's observation that “what there is of the sacred in Western secular government is the framework itself”<sup>21</sup> also pertains to Tang's civil theology. The latter can thus be distinguished from the immanent type of civil theology, which “in its more archaic forms,” seems closely related to what David Apter calls the theocratic system. Unsurprisingly, Tang rejected the idea that the government should implement a civil theology through direct legal means. The enforcement of the Confucianbased civil theology by the government would have to be restricted to the institutionalization of religious tolerance. This orientation towards constitutional provisions for religious freedom shows that Tang's Confucian civil theology concurs with liberal forms of civil or political theology. Specifically, it fundamentally accepts two major shifts in the history of Western political thought: the emphasis on a notion of political reason, which allows room for the separation of ethics/religion and politics; and an acceptance of secularizing societies and the related repercussions in politics and law. Tang's version therefore sets itself apart from imperial China's civil theology by emphatically approving the introduction of modern rights and its accompanying institutions based on the rule of law.

The major political concern of Tang's civil theology is therefore not to resacralize the political and social institutions and customs, but to bolster the normative foundation of the republic's democratic order. The aim of his civil theology is to foster the individual's loyalty to the republican state and its liberal constitution, while at the same time providing him or her with a new self-image as a republican citizen. Toward this end, core concepts of the Confucian civil theology such as “innate knowing” and “inner sagehood” function as positive limit-concepts. They serve as a normative measuring stick and a spiritual vision for the modern subject in social and political life. There is, however, no promise of creating an ideal social life form or substantially reconciling the subject with the disenchanted modern world. The kind of reconciliation offered here requires that individuals perceive the modern forms of alienated social life as the necessary condition for their efforts to attain “inner sagehood.”

Consistent with this interest in the individual's ability to cope with alienation, Tang's Confucian civil theology frames and unites his intellectual endeavors in the fields of political philosophy, ethics, religious metaphysics, cultural philosophy, and the philosophy of history. Even though his writings in specific fields might be studied as isolated parts of his oeuvre, a sound understanding of his project of modern Confucianism requires the close examination of the civil-theological axis. His modern Confucianism cannot, in other words, be detached from its theological underpinnings. A selective, post-metaphysical

dissection of his work which disregards its civil-theological dimension would result in distortions and simplifications.

Tang's civil theology cannot be productively compared with particular features of Western civil theology without considering the question of how his civil theology relates to political philosophy. Even though he did not explicitly discuss this issue, Tang tried to reconnect political thought with a Confucian anthropological vision of human existence. It is, indeed, no exaggeration to say that Tang's own political thinking finds its guiding principles in the civil-theological limit-concepts of "innate knowing" (liang zhi) and the "sage" (sheng ren). His political philosophy hence relates these limit-concepts to political reality. Tang measures, as it were, political reality, its development, actions, institutional and symbolic orders, and structures against these guiding principles. The civil theology thus forms the normative reference point for his political philosophy. In turn, the political philosophy serves the purpose of exploring, within the time frame of the modern world, the realization and temporalization of civil-theological principles. Tang's thoughts on such issues as the human will to political power, the relation of statehood and individual self-fulfillment, the distinction of state and society, the world order of "ecumenical states," the justification of democracy, the meaning and function of "humanistic culture," and civil religion in democracy, are thus closely intertwined with his civil-theological limit-concepts (see Chap. 5).

The range of issues covered by Tang's political thought indicates that his civil theology is not to be understood solely as a reaction to the modern subject's experience of alienation, but also as a reaction to political and religious violence in modern China. Tang's outlook on China's political history since the mid-19th century highlights such violent events as the rebellion of the Taiping, the Boxer Rebellion, the revolution of 1911, the Second Revolution that toppled Yuan Shikai, the rise of warlords, the Northern Expedition, the struggle between nationalists and communists in the 1920s and 1930s, and, of course, the communist victory in 1949. What has been said of John Locke as well as Hobbes and Spinoza may thus, *mutatis mutandis*, also be said with respect to Tang's interest in civil theology, namely that ". . . his chief purposes were . . . to foster civic peace in the face of political and religious enthusiasm and violence." Proponents of civil theology consequently acknowledged the "political necessity for a generally accepted account of the ultimate reality." Whereas Hobbes and Spinoza sought to secure public peace through the enforcement of a broadly acceptable, doctrinally minimized form of religious belief, Tang, like Locke, viewed the idea of institutionally guaranteeing religious tolerance as an integral element of civil theology. Civil theology itself, therefore, "was not a dogma; rather it marked the parameters of a conversation or debate which rested on the shared assumption that there was some correlation between a society's religion and its government."

An essential distinction made by Western civil theologies concerns the public cult and the "life of reason." Whereas the former is a matter of faith and entails the representation of the "minimum dogma," the latter pertains to the search for truth in philosophy and the sciences. This contrast became starker during the age of Enlightenment. Tang Junyi's civil theology draws a similar distinction, even though he did not prescribe which parts of the Confucian rituals, if any, were to be "public" in character. Yet Tang's delineation between the realms of Confucian religiosity, scientific truth-seeking, and politics corresponds to their modern differentiation in functional and institutional spheres. The conflation of faith and knowledge was, according to Tang, to be achieved only in the individual's inwardness. The public representation of Confucian religiosity was hence characterized by the absence of clerical institutions (see Chap. 10). Still, the Confucian-based civil religion was to produce a "fundamental consensus beyond public debate," even though its symbolic representation in the public sphere was much more subtle than in the case of its Christian counterparts.

As regards doctrinal aspects, there are further differences between Tang's civil theology and both ancient and modern Western forms of civil theology. For one, Tang neither referred to a comprehensive theological system, nor prescribed a religious faith based on divine revelation. What is more, when considering the question of how to arrange the relations between religious and political institutions, Tang hardly referred to extant clerical systems in China, such as Buddhist or Daoist churches. Nor did he contemplate a Confucian state cult. His Confucian civil theology, therefore, did not center on problems pertaining to the relation between the church and the state, as was the case in the Western context.

Finally, Tang's concept of civil theology differs from political theologies based on Christianity, Judaism or Islam, but also from China's imperial civil theology, insofar as it does not serve to vindicate an existing political order. On the contrary, modern Confucian civil theology questions the legitimacy of the existing Chinese political regimes of the 20th century (both on the Mainland and in Taiwan). At the same time, it anticipates the future, "authentic" political form of Confucianism: liberal democracy. Tang consequently invests the intellectual foundations of liberal democracy with a belief that is consistent with Confucian religiosity:

He [who shares the Confucian faith that all human beings are naturally endowed with humaneness—TF] can truly believe that everybody can become a Yao or Shun and that all human beings can ascend to the Heavenly kingdom. This is the Chinese Confucians' great spirit of equality. (. . .) At the same time, this is also the last and only foundation of the comprehensive spirit of democracy as a whole. If you cannot attain this in [your] faith, you will certainly in the last resort be unable to truly believe in democracy, and one day you will not take others as [your] equal. By the time you wield political power, you will definitely not let those who are not equal to you in their personality have an equal share of political power. As a matter of fact, those in the early modern Western [world] who sincerely believed in democracy also often had this faith. In the end, the teachings of Jesus as well as those of early modern Western idealism can also share this [faith]. But those who usually discuss the theoretical foundation of democracy and freedom are not necessarily able to truly recognize that they will ultimately have to erect this faith and may be able to reach a high level thereafter.

Obviously, the civil-theological outlook was not intended to evoke a passive attitude towards the modern world and its vicissitudes. On the contrary, the renewal of Confucian intellectual traditions was meant to foster an activist form of inwardness in individuals which conformed to what Tang considered the preferable outer forms of modernity—i.e. a constitutional democracy and a pluralistic, industrialized society. These outer forms were to be vindicated, albeit not exclusively, in the language of China's indigenous intellectual traditions (see Chap. 9).

Tang was not the only one to turn to Confucianism with such a liberal agenda in mind, even though his civil theology clearly stands out in terms of its complexity and scope. Apart from Zhang Junmai, Mou Zongsan 牟宗三 (1909–1995), and Xu Fuguan, liberal intellectuals like Xiao Gongquan 蕭公權 (1897–1981) and Zhang Dongsun 張東蓀 (1886–1973) also took recourse to Confucianism in order to foster acceptance of constitutional democracy in the period of civil war after 1945. Like Tang, both Xiao and Zhang did not interpret the concept of political freedom primarily from the "negative" perspective of the individual embracing his or her fundamental rights as means of a defense against the state. They did so from a Confucian (as well as Greek/republican) position that highlighted the aspect of freedom as expressed in the individual's right to participate in political life. This, in turn, would provide him or her with opportunities to actualize the natural dispositions, or "nature" (xing 性), of the human being. Xiao explicitly linked this interpretation of participation in political life with the teachings of Confucius. In a

similar way, Zhang Dongsun discussed the notion of personal “self- attainment” (zi de 自得) from the Mencius in order to demonstrate that there had existed a positive concept of freedom in ancient China. He added that this concept indeed constituted one of the strong points of Confucian thought.

This approach to a vindication of constitutional democracy in Confucian thought and language did not exclude criticism of extant types of Western democracy. The critique, however, like the description and analysis of democracy, had to take a proleptic form. After all, Xiao and Zhang, as well as Tang after 1949, faced a Chinese reality that was unfamiliar with liberal-democratic institutions and values. Indeed democracy for Tang was one of the unrealized goals of “modernization.” The objective, then, was to establish the normative and factual preconditions for the development of modern statehood, which would include constitutional government, the rule of law, and democracy. What was at stake, therefore, was not solely a justification of liberal democracy, but equally the mobilization of intellectual resources to spur its formation. Henceforth, the Chinese should be able to describe themselves at once as Confucians and as the democratic authors of the laws that bind them as citizens. Under the condition of the state’s neutrality vis-à-vis the religious preferences of the citizens, China’s future political culture was to embrace a Confucian-based humanistic culture which could be made the object of cultural patriotism. The latter would, moreover, promote commonplace attitudes of mutual respect for rights and religious tolerance in a Chinese democracy.

To be sure, Tang’s political thought is unmistakably marked by elitist elements. This should not be taken, however, as a contradiction within the liberal-democratic outlook of his modern Confucianism. After all, “classical” European liberalism, as represented for example by John Stuart Mill, also abounded with elitist ideas, not all of which have disappeared in the many revisions of political liberalism of the 20th century. It is therefore appropriate to call Tang’s position generally “liberal,” especially given the persistent vagueness of the term “liberal.” Most problematic in this regard is without doubt the assessment of how Tang might have supported a “liberal” model for the economic order of modern societies. Since he neither discussed theories of capitalism or market economy, nor devised an elaborate criticism of socialist economic models, his economic liberalism is much more a matter of uncertainty than his political liberalism.

The picture is clearer with respect to the ethical dimension of his liberal thought. The civil-theological conception of man and the notion of an immediate, non-discursive access to the highest truth constitute elements of a political anthropology with ethically “pluralistic” implications. The intuitive access to truth is only open to the individual’s subjective mind in a moment of immediate enlightenment. Accordingly, discursive truth claims can neither be justified with absolute moral certainty, nor attain uncontested political validity. Any deliberative or otherwise symbolically represented truth claim has to be seen as provisional and should be made with an awareness of its tentative nature. By implication, this means that there cannot exist a human collectivity that truly commands an access to absolute truth as collectivity, i.e. as a group that identically acts as an enlightened collective agent. Given Tang’s conviction that the absolute truth can only be grasped in an ephemeral intuition in actu, which is non-linguistic in nature, no such truth possession can be objectified or permanently incorporated into ideologies or other systems of thought. Neither can any political order as such be regarded as an immediate manifestation of an intuitively accessible, ultimate truth.

One of the major problems posed by the civil-theological foundation of Tang’s political thought is shared by many other schools, currents, and theories in the history of political thought—namely, the imposition that one is called on to believe in the notion of man and human nature as part of an underlying political anthropology. For the non-believer it is challenging, to say the least, to follow Tang when he maintains,



on the one hand, that “innate knowing” entails a moment of sudden awareness free from any form of intersubjectivity, and on the other, that individual self-cultivation which is clearly dominated by intersubjective elements (e.g. moral practice) leads to “innate knowing.” At this point, Tang’s project of reconstructing Confucianism as a civil theology begins to break down—at least from the perspective of a political philosophy grounded in intersubjectivity. This does not mean, however, that it is a complete failure. On the contrary, Tang’s civil theology encourages deliberation about central issues to political thought. This includes questions pertaining to the formation of political reason, the normative potential of Confucian traditions, and the secularization of pre-modern Chinese speculation in the transnational context of accommodating Western political ideas.

## The Watershed of 1949

Between 1934 and 1948, just five out of the considerable number of articles that Tang published during those years addressed political issues. They specifically dealt with Chinese nationalism and national consciousness and China’s national salvation movement. Two other articles from 1938 concerned China’s war of resistance against Japan.<sup>36</sup> Tang appears to have taken very little interest in political issues at this time. The immediate inducement for turning his attention in this direction was the communist takeover on the Mainland. In an article published in 1955, he explained that prior to 1949 he had been generally confident with respect to China’s political prospects and had thus felt free to indulge in purely academic work, oblivious to the rising communist threat.

After 1949, Tang was much more concerned with the fragility of individual subjectivity in times of revolutionary turmoil, ideological contestations, rapid modernization and, last but not least, exilic isolation. His Confucian philosophy now took the form of an intellectual engagement that extended beyond purely academic concerns. Significantly, at around the time he immigrated to Hong Kong and was developing his political ideas, he began to conceptualize his Confucian civil-theology. This endeavor was intimately linked to the events of 1949 and the new political constellation that emerged during that fateful period. Starting in the 1950s he indeed hardly addressed controversies about Confucian traditions or the historical reliability of Confucian scriptures from the Republican period. By all appearances, he was convinced that the cataclysmic events of 1949, the continuing process of global modernization, and the disruptions of the Cold War period represented challenges to the “humanistic tradition” of Confucianism which greatly transcended those that had been previously raised in China. One can surmise that this was the reason why Tang very rarely mentioned earlier works by such prominent figures as Liang Shuming, Xiong Shili 熊十力 (1885–1968) and Zhang Junmai.

While the historical contexts of Tang’s initiation to political thought are fairly easy to discern, the same cannot be said regarding the circumstances surrounding the eventually drastic decline in his production of political writings. For reasons that remain unclear, Tang turned away from political philosophy after the mid-1960s. This may have been due to the beginning of the so-called Cultural Revolution, with its crude anti-Confucian propaganda. During the 1970s, his rejection of the “Cultural Revolution” might have brought him somewhat closer to the anti-communist regime of the Nationalist Party (Guomindang; GMD) in Taiwan. Indeed, he gave an interview in 1974 that gives a glimpse of the enormous impact that the victory of Chinese communism and the subsequent events of the “Cultural Revolution” had on the intellectuals in exile. Tang further noted how strongly he reacted to film footage of the mass movements of the “Cultural Revolution” that was shown in movie theaters in Hong Kong around 1972, comparing such slogan shouting masses of people to the mass rallies that had taken place in Nazi Germany.

During his years in exile, Tang’s judgments about the communist regime on the Mainland were consistently negative. In contrast, his attitude towards the regime of the GMD was much more

ambivalent. This may be explained by the fact that, to begin with, Tang had been briefly employed by the bureaucracy of the GMD government during the Second World War. In 1939, he had accepted an offer to work as an editor on special assignment in the Ministry of Education in the war-time capital of Chongqing. At that time, he was assisting Chen Lifu 陳立夫, the Minister of Education, with a book project. Chen had been one of the chief theoreticians of the party's right wing and an eminent figure in the fascist-inspired "New Life Movement" instigated in 1934. Tang quit his position in the Ministry of Education after little over a year to teach philosophy at Central University (Zhongyang Daxue 中央大學) in October 1940, which by then had been moved from Nanjing to Chongqing. In 1941, at age 32, he was listed by the Ministry of Education as being qualified for a position as full professor. In the same year, he became the editor of the journal *Ideal and Culture* (Lixiang yu Wenhua 理想與文化), which headed up the government's wartime effort to refute the Japanese militarist spirit and promote the general awareness of the superiority of China's spiritual culture.

During the post-war period, Tang's view on the GMD vacillated between tacit acceptance, explicit praise of its success in economic and technological modernization, and open criticism of its post-war failure to establish a democratic government in Taiwan (see Chap. 9). His criticism culminated in an article from 1954 in which he called on Chiang Kai-shek to reaffirm that the presidency represented the whole population and step down as chairman of the GMD. Besides, looking back at the GMD's political record prior to 1949, Tang criticized the GMD's "fascism" after the dissolution of its first united front with the Communist Party of China (CCP) and during the war against Japan, when the fascist tendencies included a blind adoration for a spirit of war. He also condemned the fact that the GMD was still unable to attain a clear understanding of the (ethical) nature of the state and had thus failed to establish a modern nation-state. Moreover, he occasionally distanced himself in private from the regime of the GMD. For example, during a trip to Taiwan in August 1956, he tellingly commented in a letter to his wife Xie Tingguang 謝廷光 (1916–2000) that politics was not as progressive in Taiwan as industry, agriculture, or the military. Without doubt, Tang was neither in favor of a one-party state, nor did he sympathize with earlier efforts of the GMD to create mass movements.

Tang's judgments about the GMD government between the 1940s and the 1970s must be seen in relation to the major changes that resulted from the GMD's retreat to Taiwan in 1949. This included the implementation of martial law, the thorough reorganization of the party in 1952 that solidified its one-party rule, and, eventually, the GMD's gradual departure from harsh authoritarianism during the 1960s. That said, the course of events on the Mainland after 1949 also seems to have profoundly influenced Tang's attitude towards the regime of the GMD. In comparison to the communist efforts that were made to dismantle China's cultural tradition and eliminate alleged enemies of the revolution, the GMD regime of the late 1960s appeared to be the lesser of two evils. For one, the GMD had reacted against the "Cultural Revolution" by instigating a large-scale, prolonged movement for the "Revival of Chinese Culture" (Zhonghua wenhua fuzheng yundong 中華文化復興運動) in 1966. Tang, however, was still far from being enthusiastic about the GMD. He declined, for example, an invitation to contribute an article to the *Zhongyang Monthly* (Zhongyang Yuekan) on the occasion of the GMD's celebration of the 80th anniversary of the founding of Sun Yat-sen's "Revive China Society" (Xing Zhong Hui 興中會, 1894) in August 1974. Even though he explicitly recognized the GMD government as the government of China and annually attended the national day celebration of the Republic of China, he neither attended official celebrations of president Chiang Kai-shek's birthday, nor referred to Sun Yat-sen as the "father of the nation" (guofu).

Overall, Tang was a more outspoken critic of the GMD regime before the outbreak of the “Cultural Revolution” than he was afterwards. Although he travelled to Taiwan on two separate occasions during the 1950s and 1960s, meeting with Chiang Kai-shek and Chiang Ching-kuo 蔣經國, he repeatedly voiced his skepticism about the GMD's political agenda and its refusal to establish a democratic government. He thus deplored that the advances the GMD had made towards “democratic, constitutional politics” and its democratic convictions were “questionable,” marking at most only a “beginning.” When reconsidering China's political development in the 20th century in a three-part article published in the Homeland Weekly (Zuguo Zhoukan 祖國周刊) in 1958, he was also clear that the GMD had failed to establish true democracy in China. The GMD, for its part, leveled severe criticism against “overseas personalities” who were openly accused in a party journal in 1958 of playing into the hands of the Chinese communists. They were blamed for criticizing the political situation in Taiwan, even though they actually held anti-communist convictions. This criticism was openly refuted by Zhang Junmai. It is no exaggeration to say that after 1949 an intellectual-political battle unfolded outside the People's Republic of China (PRC) over the interpretation and implications of “Free China.” Confucian intellectuals like Tang Junyi, Zhang Junmai, Mou Zongsan, and Xu Fuguan were unwilling to subscribe to the GMD's definitions of “Free China,” Chinese nationalism, and Chinese culture. <>

## **THE GREEN SEA OF HEAVEN: FIFTY GHAZALS FROM THE DÍWÁN OF HÁFIZ** translated by Elizabeth T. Gray, Jr. with an Introduction by Daryush Shayegan [Library of Persian: Text and Contexts in Persian Religions and Spirituality, White Cloud Press, 9781883991067]

Hafiz is the preeminent poet of Persian Sufism and one of the great poets of world literature. **THE GREEN SEA OF HEAVEN: FIFTY GHAZALS FROM THE DÍWÁN OF HÁFIZ** is regarded as the finest English translation of his poetry. Elizabeth Gray's translations are informed by her thorough knowledge of Persian and the Persian poetic tradition. (Many recent books attributed to Hafiz have been produced by persons who do not know Persian at all!) This bilingual edition also includes two brilliant studies of Hafiz by Gray and Daryush Shayegan, plus helpful notes to the translation.

Khwāja Shams ud-Dīn Muhammad Hafiz -i Shīrāzī (d. 1389) is acknowledged to be the unrivalled master of the classical Persian ghazal, a brief and strict lyric form. Throughout the Persian-speaking world one hears his verses recited or sung in the bazaar, on the radio, and at spiritual gatherings. His *Diwān*, or collected works, is held in such high esteem that, like the Qur'ān, it is used for divination and augury. Nevertheless, about Háfiz's life we have legends but few facts. We do not even have an authentic text of his *Diwān*.

### **Hafiz and his Historical Context**

The extant sources of biographical information—a preface to an early edition of his work, anecdotes and biographical sketches, references by other writers, the poems themselves—strengthen some of the legends and bring others into question, but are not ultimately reliable. What we have are facts about his life that seem consistent among the sources, and we know that the era in which he lived was one of both political chaos and extraordinary literary and artistic achievement. We know that he lived in one of the most beautiful cities in the world.

Háfiz was born in Isfahan, in what is now central Iran, somewhere between 1317 and 1325. His father, Bahá' ud-Din, was a merchant, and moved his family south from Isfahan to the city of Shiraz when Hafiz was a young boy.<sup>1</sup> Shiraz lies along the banks of the Ruknabad river, in the province of Fars, nestled in a circle of mountains and surrounded by vineyards. In Háfiz's day it was a flourishing center of Islamic civilization, and he developed a deep and lifelong affection for the city. Then, as now, it was famous for its beauty, its wines, and its exquisite gardens.

Háfiz's father died when Háfiz was still a child, leaving the family in difficult circumstances. Nevertheless, Háfiz seems to have acquired a thorough and comprehensive classical education. He was fluent in the Persian and Arabic languages and traditions, and educated in the quranic sciences. His pen name, Háfiz ("the preserver," "the guardian"), implies that he could recite the entire Qur'an from memory. He is said to have worked as a baker's apprentice and a copyist until he found adequate patronage for his poetry, and is said to have taught in one of Shiraz's theological schools later in his life.

Háfiz was born in the last days of the Il-Khánid empire established by Hülegü Khan. A grandson of Chingiz Khan, Hülegü was best known for his sack of Baghdad, the capital of the far reaching 'Abbasid empire, in 1258. During Háfiz's childhood and adolescence the Il-Khánid empire disintegrated into small rival states and factions. Rebellion, civil war, and intradynastic treachery were common, and cities changed hands many times. A brief discussion of the squabbling dynasties that existed in southern Iran during Háfiz's lifetime will give the modern reader a sense for the context in which Háfiz wrote, and perhaps a better understanding of the poet and his work. Although of little importance in the grand scheme of Islamic history, these minor rulers were the patrons upon whose favor Háfiz depended for his life and livelihood.

While Háfiz was in his teens Sháh Abú Isháq of the Injú dynasty consolidated power in Fars after a seven-year struggle with his three brothers. Abú Isháq was a tolerant ruler, easy-going and artistically inclined, and brought stability to the region. We know that Háfiz's literary career began to flourish during Abú Isháq's twelve-year reign because several of his poems mention patrons who served as viziers at Abú Isháq's court.<sup>2</sup> In 1353 Abú Isháq was overthrown and eventually executed by Shah Mubariz ud-Dfn Muhammad, founder of the Muzaffarid dynasty based in Yazd. In contrast to Abú Isháq, Mubariz was a strictly orthodox Muslim, and both courtly delights and the taverns of Shiraz suffered during the five years of his puritanical rule. Despite the artistic chill, and perhaps demonstrating a high degree of skill in political adaptation, Háfiz continued to write at court, perhaps under the patronage of Mubariz's Chief Minister. Returning from a successful campaign against Isfahan and Tabriz in 1358, Mubariz was deposed, blinded, and thrown in prison by his two sons, who divided their father's kingdom between them. Qutb ud-Dfn Mahmúd claimed Isfahan, and Jalál ud-Dfn Shah Shujá` began his long reign in Shiraz, which, although troubled, saw the expansion of Shah Shujá`s dominion over much of the old Il-Kánid empire.

Sháh Shujá` was not only a consistent patron of the arts and of learning, but a poet in his own right, both in Persian and Arabic. It was during his 27-year reign that Háfiz flourished, and wrote the poetry that became famous throughout the Islamic world. Apparently the relationship between Háfiz and his ruler/patron was not always smooth. One story suggests that Háfiz fell out of favor for mocking both Sháh Shujá`s panegyrists and those less skilled in the crafting of verse (presumably including Shah Shujá`). During this time he is said to have spent one or two years in Isfahan and Yazd, but we have no certain evidence of this. Aside from this interlude of disfavor, and despite lucrative offers of patronage from courts as far away as Baghdad and India, Háfiz could never bring himself to leave Shiraz.

By 1380, when Hafiz was in his sixties, Timur Lang (known to Occidentals' as "Tamerlane") had consolidated power in Central Asia north of the Oxus river, and turned his attention to the territories of the old Il-Khánid empire. In 1380 his assaults on the provinces of Khurasan, Sistan, and Mazandaran laid waste to the countryside and razed any town that tried to defend itself. As an instrument of war his use of terror was meticulous and persuasive: the story of 2,000 defenders of a town in Sistan who were built into a wall while still alive traveled quickly, and served as a vivid reminder of the price of resistance. In 1382 Timur again came south into Persia, but a negotiated truce between Timur and Shah Shujá` ensured that the Muzaffarid possessions were spared the horrors visited on neighboring provinces.

In 1387 the Muzaffarids were not so lucky. Shah Shujá` had been succeeded by his son, Zayn ul-`Abidín, who declined to offer obeisance to Timur in person. Aggravated by this display of disrespect Timur marched against Fars, and upon arriving in Isfahan demanded a hefty financial contribution from its inhabitants. The rebuke tendered by the Isfahanis

included the killing of several of Timur's tax collectors. In response Timur looted the city and massacred its entire population. He had a tall minaret of 70,000 skulls built as a grim memorial, and proceeded south toward Shiraz. Zayn ul-`Abidín fled to Shushtar, where he was promptly blinded and imprisoned by his cousin. Timur entered Shiraz without bloodshed.

The legendary meeting between Timur and Háfiz is said to have taken place during Timur's sojourn in Shiraz. Timur is said to have called Háfiz into his presence to scold him for the following bayt:

If that Turk of Shiraz would take my heart in his hand,  
I would give for his Hindu [i.e. black] mole both Bukhárá and Samarqand.

Timur pointed out that he had conquered and plundered much of the world in-order to build and beautify Bukhara and Samarqand, his native cities and seat of government. He was incensed that Háfiz could suggest trading both for the affection of a young, lithe, Turkish slave with a beauty mark. Háfiz, with a deep bow, is said to have replied, "Sir, it is because of such prodigality that I have fallen into poverty and hard times? Timur was apparently charmed, and ordered that Háfiz be rewarded instead of imprisoned.

Between 1387 and 1392 various Muzaffarid brothers and cousins fought for control of Shiraz, Yazd, Kirman, and other cities in Fars. In 1392 Timur ended the family dispute by taking Shiraz and executing the remaining dynastic contenders, with the exception of the blind Zayn ul-`Abidin, whom he took with him to Samarqand. Timur's pursuit of conquest and terror continued (he executed 100,000 people in Delhi in 1398). Upon his death in 1405 he was succeeded by his son, Sháh Rukh, who had difficulty in holding together the empire his father had created.

Háfiz did not live to see the demise of the Muzaffarids. He died in 1389 or 1390, and was buried in the Musalla Gardens, which lie gracefully along the banks of the Ruknabad river in the city he loved so well. As he predicted in several of his ghazals, his tomb and its surrounding gardens became a place of pilgrimage, and remain so to this day.

## Literature at Court

To understand the role of the poet at court in the fourteenth century we must examine courtly tradition in Persia before the advent of Islam.' Pre-Islamic Persia was primarily an urban society governed by kings who kept their ceremonial distance from the populace and were considered almost, if not actually, divine. Court life was elaborate and elegant, and the formal ranks of the nobility placed great

emphasis on courtly manners and appropriate behavior. The king's retinue included musicians, dancers, singers, and other entertainers. Of these, the poet's place was considered highly prestigious. Poets and their patrons had a special relationship with one another: the patron provided security, support, and privilege; the poet served as entertainer, panegyrist, and, as appropriate, intimate counsellor. Most of this courtly tradition was incorporated by Islamic and Arab rulers, and did not change dramatically during the Mongol era.

In the fourteenth century rulers and their ministers were the primary patrons of the arts, including poetry, and the arts flourished during these turbulent times. Poetry was composed for the patron and his retinue, who were usually well-educated in the Persian and Arabic language and literary traditions. Poetry was recited orally, or sung, in this very public context, as entertainment or diversion, as an offering for a specific occasion, as an entry in a poetic competition, or as a general or specific statement on a topic. Poets used a variety of poetic forms, of which the ghazal was one.

### The Ghazal, its Formal Requirements

Hafiz's *Diwān* consists almost entirely of ghazals, and he so perfected this formidable verse form that none of his many successors has ever matched his depth, elegance, and precision. The classical Persian ghazal has between five and twelve lines (bans), each of which is divided into two hemistiches (misra'). In the opening bayts (the matla'), each misra' ends in an identical rhyme, and this monorhyme is repeated at the end of each bayt for the remainder of the poem. Often the rhyme includes one or more words (radii), not simply the final syllable.

Although Persian is an accentual, Indo-European language, the meters used in Persian verse are quantitative, and were adopted from classical Arabic prosody. The first misra' sets the meter to which all other misra' conform, although on occasion the poet may substitute two short syllables for one long syllable. Depending on the meter, a bayt may have between twenty-four and thirty-two syllables. The rhythmical pattern and rhyme scheme can be seen in the following diagram of a ghazal in a typical meter (Ramal sālim makhbūn mandhūf). The reader needs to bear in mind that Persian is read from right to left.

A -- --oo --oo --o-	A -- --oo --oo --o
A -- --oo --oo --o-	B -- --oo --oo --o
A -- --oo --oo --o-	C -- --oo --oo --o
A -- --oo --oo --o-	D -- --oo --oo --o
A -- --oo --oo --o-	E -- --oo --oo --o
	F -- --oo --oo --o
	A -- --oo --oo --o

As a rule, the last bayt (maqta') contains the poet's name or pen name (takhallus). While the complex and rigid requirements of the ghazal form defeated many less talented poets, it forced others, like Háfiz, to write verse of compressed and brilliant intensity.

### Origins and Evolution

While the term ghazal can be used in a general way to mean a genre of lyric poetry concerned primarily with love, in its more restricted sense it means the formal, classical Persian lyric perfected in the



thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. From uncertain origins, it has evolved differently in the Arabic, Persian, Ottoman, and Urdu literary traditions.

Some believe that the classical Persian ghazal evolved from the *nasfb*, the brief and often erotic prologue to the Arabic *qasida*, a longer ode with a ghazal-like rhyme scheme composed on panegyric, didactic, elegiac, or religious subjects. Others believe the ghazal developed from early Iranian folk poetry, about which we know nothing. Others believe it to be a blending of indigenous Persian lyric with the more formal structures and themes of earlier Arabic poetry.

By the tenth century the traditional themes explored by early ghazal composers had hardened into literary convention. Thereafter, in addition to the rhetorical figures and embellishments required of all good Persian poetry, the conservative taste of the Persian courts demanded that poets continue to improvise on the themes of love, longing, wine, intoxication, separation and sorrow, roses, nightingales, deserts, and departing caravans. Excellence lay not in creating a new or unique image, but in using the familiar images and conventions in innovative ways.

The ghazal reached its high level of formal development with the work of Muslih ud-Din Sa`dí (1256-1292), also of Shiraz, author of the famous *Gulistán*. His ghazals were beautifully composed around a single theme, usually of a more moralistic than spiritual nature. Fifty years later Háfiz, in command of the ghazals traditional imagery and themes and at home with its intricate formal requirements, blended eroticism, mysticism, and panegyric into verse of unsurpassed beauty.

## Conventions and Imagery

These ghazals are often puzzling to the "Westerner" who approaches them for the first time. The same images reappear in poem after poem after poem after poem. The poems do not seem to go anywhere: there is no opening, no action, no ultimate resolution or answer. Sometimes the lines seem unrelated to one another. And everything seems ambiguous: is the poet talking to the one he loves? Or is he reproaching a patron? Or is this a nugget of wisdom aimed at the disciple who seeks union with God? If the poet is talking to or about his beloved, is the beloved a man or a woman? Is it actually the poet talking? And isn't drinking alcohol a violation of Islamic law?

At first glance, and in comparison with other classical Persian literary forms (the panegyric *qasida*, the romance, the narrative *mathnawi*, the witty *rubá'i*), the ghazal seems to be a personal or even confessional poem. The poet seems to be sharing his personal feelings. With time it becomes clear that this is not the case. The poet is using an array of personae and images to speak of love in a way that expresses an ideal, and does so within a fiction. The troubador poets in medieval Europe crafted their songs in a similar way.

The poet who declares his identity in the closing bayt of the ghazal, the voice speaking throughout the ghazal, is a persona. It is the "I" of an "I-Thou" relationship, and the "I" speaks of his searing love for the perpetually unreachable "Thou." The "I" and "Thou" may be lover and beloved, poet and patron, mystic and God, or the poet may intend a bayt or ghazal to suggest all of these relationships. However it is framed, the ghazal deals with unconditional love and devotion, the anguish of separation and longing, the ecstasy of union, the creation of obligations, and the honoring of promises.

The ambiguities that surround the speaker and the object of his love stem from a variety of sources. The politics of court and Islamic prohibitions against extramarital relationships forced the poet to veil the identity of his beloved. Refined tact and diplomacy were important in addressing powerful and perhaps

capricious patrons whose power over one's life and livelihood was absolute. References to things considered heretical by Islam could not be discussed too explicitly.

In addition, poets took advantage of the fact that Persian pronouns do not indicate gender. It is usually impossible to tell whether the Beloved is male or female or divine. Háfiz exploited these ambiguities, powerfully and artfully, to suggest different types of "I-Thou" relationships and to create resonances between them.' It is why "every listener seems to find in it an answer to his question, every reader thinks he is discovering an allusion to his desire."

## Imagery

Háfiz could draw upon, and was constrained by, the rich array of images and analogies that had been used and developed in the preceding centuries. To the well-educated courtly listener each image held, embedded within it, a host of associations and recollections. Delighting an audience demanded verse act like a prism, bringing different light from new angles to a rich and familiar image. Háfiz used imagery from many sources: stories and sayings from the Islamic tradition, from pre-Islamic Persian epics, Sufi literature, astronomy, astrology, alchemy, and the flora and fauna of Shiraz's gardens. To offer here a lengthy explanation and analysis of the various elements that make up the ghazal's canon of imagery would not be fruitful. Some are discussed in Daryush Shayegan's Introduction, others in the footnotes to the individual ghazals." Nevertheless, a brief sketch of the cast of characters and primary images will be helpful to the reader encountering these poems for the first time.

There is the Beloved, who has the tall and swaying stature of the cypress, and the radiant, pure, and perfect face of the moon. The Lover seeks union with the Beloved, to give up his soul to the Beloved, to become lost or annihilated in the Beloved as the moth is consumed by the flame to which it is attracted. The Beloved is the source and incarnation of love and beauty, the ultimately beautiful rose unfolding in the garden, and the Lover, pining in separation or loss, begs the dawn wind or the hoopoe to act as a messenger or go-between, to bring news of the Beloved, to carry a message or plaint to him (or her).

The true Lover understands the ecstasy and the pain of loving, for him it is both his elixir and his daily bread. He is the one for whom Love is the sole spiritual imperative, the ultimate intoxicant, the only law that governs an enlightened soul. Lovers are the disciples of Beauty, disciples of the Beloved, disciples of Love. They take up the path of Love and pass through its waystations under the guidance of a Master, a wise elder (the pir). The recluses are Lovers: they adhere only to Love's, law, and to the uninitiated their behavior seems dissolute and blasphemous.

Arrayed in opposition to the Lover are the false Lovers and the enforcers of orthodoxy. The orthodox scholars and judges preach and enforce the Islamic law, or sharl'a. They condemn intoxication, they demand penitence, they insist on correct behavior. Háfiz mocks them because in their blind adherence to- the letter of Islamic law they miss God and His message completely. Their own corrupt behavior is at variance with their preachings and prohibitions. They are blind to what matters.

There is also the rival, the impostor or pretender, the mudda'i, who claims to understand Love, who claims intimacy with the Beloved. The impostor's words are empty of wisdom, he is not an intimate of the secrets. Nevertheless, he babbles on about love, offering his audience unenlightened verse.

A word on taverns, wine, winemasters, cupbearers, and Zoroastrians is in order. Islam's prohibition against drinking alcohol meant that within the Islamic world the making and serving of wine fell to Zoroastrians and Christians and others. Nevertheless, in Háfiz's ghazals the "tavern of the Magi" usually

suggests an esoteric sanctuary or gathering, an assembly of believers, which exists beyond the borders of orthodox Islam. It was wise to veil one's speech when discussing such things.

Wine drinking parties were a regular and elaborate fixture of courtly life. At these gatherings wine was served by young Turkic slaves, imported from northern Iran and Central Asia as children. They were taught weaponry and riding, to sing and to serve wine. They were thought most beautiful just at the moment that they entered puberty, when the first traces of facial hair became visible. These cupbearers were the object of poetic and physical love. While in Western literature we are unaccustomed, and uncomfortable, with homoerotic love, the reader should understand that by convention the Beloved is male.

### Unity: The Ongoing Debate

To the reader accustomed to Western literature the ghazal is puzzling and perhaps frustrating: there is no plot, no narrative, no movement toward a climax or resolution in the sense that Westerners understand dramatic development. Indeed, depending on the edition, Háfiz's bayts in a specific ghazal may appear in a different sequences, rarely affecting the ghazál's power as a poem.

Apparently Sháh Shujá' was the first person to raise the question of whether, or in what manner, there is "unity" in Háfiz's ghazals. Háfiz supposedly answered to the effect that most people seemed to like his poems, and that in fact while other poets had trouble finding an audience beyond their own city gates, Háfiz's poems were read throughout the Islamic world? While acknowledging the truth of Háfiz's response, others continue to debate Sháh Shujá' 's question. Opinions as to whether the ghazals have "unity", and if so, in what way, have varied with the fashions of literary criticism.

Some Western critics decided that atomism was the defining principle: there was no unifying element, each bayt was like a perfect, separate pearl. The ghazal was simply a series of pearls on a string of a certain length, "orient pearls at random strung." Other readers have felt a sense of completeness, of "unity," in a Háfizean ghazal, and have tried in different ways to describe its source. Some find it to be similar to the pattern in a carpet or tapestry: variations of shape and color that repeat and connect to form a whole. Others describe it as a crystal, each facet illuminating a different aspect of one or several themes. Some have described the ghazal as polyphonic or contrapuntal, having two or three themes that weave together, and recur in different forms, in different registers. Some have likened the ghazal to the surface of a pool: from two or three themes dropped like pebbles come concentric rings of images that expand, intersect, and create patterns of resonance., Suffice it to say that ghazals are not like any other "Western" lyric. For centuries people have been deeply moved by these poems, and I would urge the reader approaching these ghazals for the first time to question his or her own embedded literary assumptions and to brandish lightly, at the outset, the templates of Western literary criticism.

### Textual Problems

We have no established text of Háfiz's Díwán, and it seems that Háfiz did not compile one during his lifetime. The editions that proliferated throughout the Islamic world after his death attest to the quality and fame of his work, but as they grew in number the texts themselves became more corrupt. Even if Háfiz had circulated different versions of specific ghazals, or had revised and edited earlier ghazals as he went along, it would not explain the alterations and expanded editions. Copyists the world over are likely to misread or miscopy manuscripts, and might "improve" a bayt by substituting a "better" word, but it seems that lines in similar meters by other authors, or whole ghazals, may have been added to "enhance" the edition. Lesser writers may have sought to ensure that their work would live forever by inserting a ghazal of their own among those of Háfiz.

Since the early sixteenth century efforts have been made to define an authentic Diwán. The preface to an early edition by Háfiz's "friend" Gulandam suggests that it is a first edition, but that assumption has not been tested. Qazvini's and Ghání's 1941 critical edition was based on the oldest manuscripts available at the time, and in their judgment none of these four manuscripts upon which they relied was related to the others. Since 1941 more than fourteen manuscripts have come to light that appear to pre-date the ones used by Qazvini and Ghání, but they have not been extensively studied in relation to one another. More work needs to be done, and may or may not result in an authentic text.

Khánlari's edition was used for these translations, and the editions by Qazvini and Ghání, by Ahmad and Ná'íní, and by Anjavi were consulted.

In addition, I have drawn extensively on the commentaries by Khurram Sháhi, Rajá'f, and Súdi, and consulted teachers, scholars, and advisors in the U.S., Iran, and India, as well as previous translations of Háfiz's work.

### The Visionary Topography of Harz by Daryush Shayegan

Khwāja Shams ud-Din Muhammad Háfiz-i Shírázi, the Persian poet of the fourteenth century, is one of the greatest mystics and lyrical poets of all time. The Iranian tradition has designated him the *lisán-al-ghayb*, "the tongue of the Invisible" and *tarjumán al-asrár*, "the interpreter of the mysteries." And this for good reason, for of all the poets who have written in Persian—and there are very many of them he has enjoyed the most privileged position, being, as it were, the intimate interlocutor of every heart in distress, of every soul that is seized by mystical exaltation. It is no accident therefore that Persians often consult his Diwán, in the same way that the Chinese consult the I Ching.

Being the interpreter of the mysteries, Hafiz is also an undisputed master of spiritual hermeneutic (*ta'wil*); I would even say that his vision is fashioned of the *ta'wil*, as the poet not only searches into the unfathomable mysteries which open up thanks to the divine theophanies, but he is himself the locus where these same theophanies unveil themselves.. This vision is reflected as much in the structure of his ghazals as in the almost magical perfection of his word, and in the sovereign art with which he maintains complete and undisputed mastery over all the resources and nuances of the Persian language; this vision is such that with him the art of the mystical lyric reaches an apotheosis that has never been surpassed: he marks both the supreme flowering and the uttermost limit of his art.

All the millenary genius of Persian art: the judicious equilibrium between form and content, the economy of means, the striking concision of paradoxical ideas, the affective and polyvalent tonalities of verbal magic amplifying itself on several registers, the polymorphic correspondences of symbols, the bewitching aesthetic of the Eternal Feminine scattered like so many alluring images in the world's mirrors, condense miraculously in his art. This is why Háfiz is not simply a great Persian poet, he is the 'miracle' of Persian literature; it is in him that the millenary sap of a culture is crystallized, which, grafting the prophetic tradition of the Muhammadan Revelation on to the ancient spirit of Iran, made a synthesis so full, so profound, that it became, as it were, the *humanitas* of all Islam, oriental and Iranian.

Every Persian has a private bond with Háfiz. It matters little whether he is learned, mystic, unlettered, or *rend* (inspired libertine), as Háfiz called himself. Every Persian finds in him a part of himself, discovers in him an unexplored niche in his own memory, a fragrant recollection from the interior garden of which he is the unique guardian. It is because of this communion that the poet's tomb is a place of pilgrimage for all Persians. Everyone goes there to seek be it but a particle of his presence: humble people from the bazaar, minor officials, intellectuals, poets, ragged beggars, all go there to collect themselves and to receive the poet's message in the silence of their heart.

How is it that Iran's most esoteric poet should also be the most popular? How do we reconcile this symbolic language with a popularity which makes the poet intimate Friend in every household? This popularity does not owe so much to the clarity of his language as to the occult correspondence which it awakens in every heart that hearkens to his call: every listener seems to find in it an answer to his question, every reader thinks he is discovering an allusion to his desire, every man finds in him a sympathetic interlocutor capable of understanding his secret, and of harmonizing it with the modulations of his song. For example, love assumes different forms according to whether it is envisaged on one level or another. It will be passionate and earthly love for some, and a profound nostalgia in quest of their original soil for others; and it will be the divine Beloved for all those who, opening themselves to what lies behind the veil of symbols, attain to a level of first events. Hence this 'connivance' of the poet with all his readers, whatever register and level they belong to.

Thus, the understanding of his hearers varies according to their knowledge, their sensibility, but each receives his or her due and no one goes away empty. With the reading of Háfiz, as with the Qur'án, the less one comprehends intellectually, the more one receives spiritually. By the association of shaded tonalities endlessly reverberating on the keyboard of the senses, transmuting correspondences into synchronic states amplified more and more, this poetry penetrates the heart, creating a juxtaposition of states of the soul, by which the receptive soul and the symbolic tenor of the poem harmonize in the coincidence of the moment, so that this synchronicity of symbol and soul becomes the mystical configuration of a precise state.

This is also due to the particular structure of the ghazal itself. The reader has the impression that the poet has an eye "with multiple facets;" the world no longer unfolds itself in a simultaneous blossoming. Each distich is a complete whole, a world; within the ghazal one distich is not joined chronologically to the next but is synchronically consubstantial with it. It is like a world within a larger world, which forms an integral part of the Díwán, as this latter forms an integral part of the cosmic vision of the poet. So, from one distich to the next, the same tonalities are amplified on extended registers, calling forth magical correspondences at every level.

The source of the energy of the poetic vision is the eye of the poet's heart, which is at once both the point of origin of all the soul's vibrations, and the center which "spatializes" the space of the vision. This synchronic coincidence of planes of vision is the beginning of the soul's dialectic movement, since the limitations of the vision are made good by a continual flow back and forth between the heart of the poet and the primeval source from which he draws his inspiration. In other words, a perpetual oscillation between self-revelation of the Divine in its self-concealment, and the concealment of the Divine in its self-revelation; between a Beauty that attracts as it repels and a Majesty that repels as it attracts. Why is the heart the starting point of this movement? Because, as Háfiz says as he addresses the Beloved:

Thou hast set the Treasure of Love in our ravaged heart,  
Thou has thrown the shadow of fortune over the ruined corner.

Here we encounter three essential symbols of the dialectic of love in the work of Háfiz: that is to say, the dispenser of the Treasure of Love, Love itself, and the ravaged heart. This Treasure, the poet adds, is also a profound sorrow (gham), a poignant nostalgia:

The Lord of pre-eternity (sultán-i azal) offers us the Treasure of Sorrow (ganj-i gham-i `ishq)  
That we may descend into this ravaged dwelling (manzil-i wiráneh)  
Let us look at the connotations of the symbolism of the heart in speculative gnosis.

The heart, says the Islamic mystic, is the Throne of Mercy, and Shaykh Muhammad LAW, who wrote the famous commentary on Mahmúd Shabestari's *Rose Garden of Mystery* (*Gulshan-i Ráz*), adds, "just as in the outside world, the Throne is the epiphany of the name of Mercy, likewise in the interior world it is the heart (qalb) that is its epiphany. At every breath of the Merciful One, God manifests himself in a new theophany in the heart of the believer." The heart of man is always in motion (the world qalb in Arabic means both "heart" and "revolution" in the sense of inversion); a motion that manifests itself in terms of renewal and resurrection at every instant, and which works in such a way that the instant of disappearance coincides immediately with the appearance of its counterpart. The heart is therefore the center of the Throne and the Throne in its periphery; being the initial point of epiphany, it is also the center which calls into being the space of vision. It is for this reason, says Háfiz, that the heart holds the cup of Jam, the cup of cosmic vision, which is also the mirror reflecting the invisible world (*ghayb namá*). But the heart is also ravaged with wounds (*majrúh*) as it broods longingly over the stigmata inflicted on it by the Beloved, and acts as a shield against the innumerable arrows that the Beloved's brows let loose. The heart is also purple with the flame of Love and bears as a mark of devotion the "scar of the tulip" (*dagh-i lála*). This scar, says Háfiz, "which we have placed in our heart is able to set ablaze the harvest of a hundred rational devout worshippers."

These three essential symbols: the Lord of pre-eternity, the sorrow of love, and the ravaged heart, raise us immediately to the level of the first theophanies, and bring us within the orbit of the famous diving saying according to which God said:

I was a hidden Treasure, I longed to be known.

So I created the creation, in order that I should be known.

God is a Hidden Treasure, that is, an unfathomable essence in the Mystery of Ipseity. But this treasure longs to be known, and initially in His innermost heart a strong desire manifests itself, a nostalgia to reveal Himself; then comes the second stage which fulfills this desire and designates the Names that were concealed in the undifferentiated Thought of God.

Every Name of God aspires to be made manifest, this is what the concept of God's nostalgia and His Love of manifesting himself (*hubb-i hudúrí*) conveys; it demands an epiphany, a mirror in which it can be reflected: the knower (*`álim*) aspires to be known (*ma`lúm*). This mutual aspiration, this sympathy between Archetypes striving to be invested with the Divine Presence and Names seeking a mirror to contemplate themselves in, constitutes the second visionary theophany (*shuhúdí*), or the marriage of Names and Attributes. But the Archetypes are mirrors of Divine Beauty, and the image reflected in them is the world. To this two-way movement—the longing of the Hidden Treasure to reveal itself in creatures, and the Love of these creatures, aspiring to be united to the Names of which they are epiphanies—correspond the two arcs of descent (*qaws-i nuzúlí*) and ascent (*qaws-i `urújí*). The descent symbolizes the ceaseless influx of Being; the ascent symbolizing the return movement to God; the former symbolizes the creation in a recurrent and never-failing effusion, the latter the resurrections of beings and their return to their initial and final cause. The cosmic vision of the poet opens into the space between these two arcs, the one originating from the pre-eternity of God (*azal*), and the other starting out from man himself to flow into post-eternity (*abad*).

## Between Pre-Eternity and Post-Eternity

It is in alluding to this same space between *azal* and *abad* that the poet says:

From the Dawn of the first Beginning till the twilight of the last End,  
Friendship and Love have drawn inspiration from one sole pact, one single trust.



Here we enter upon Háfiz's visionary topography, we arrive at a world whose co-ordinates are not ordered in the quantitative time of chronological events, and which consequently is neither historical, nor linear, nor progressive, but a world in the interior of which every event is presence, and every duration an instant of this presence. Unquestionably, with regard to the eternity of the Divine itself, the pre-eternal and post-eternal have no meaning, since in its Essence, pre- and post- coincide in the indeterminacy of the divine Ipseity. They take on meaning only in relation to the shadow of God, in relation to that Other-than-He which, while it is a veil obscuring His face, remains no less a necessary expedient of His self-revelation. God and man are the poles of creation; it is between these two poles—one the Origin with regard to descent and the other the Origin with regard to return, that pre- and post-eternity derive all their direction and meaning.

Without the creation of man, who took upon himself the destiny of his folly, there would have been neither initial nor final point, there would have been only the occult eternity of the Hidden Treasure. To see the world as a respite between the initial point and the final point of the cycle of Being is already to anticipate one's return, indeed one's eschatology; it is also to participate in that "play of the magical glance" (*kirishma-i jádú*), in that cycle of love thanks to which the two-way movement of the two arcs developing in opposite directions, sets the cosmic wheel of Being turning. In this state, the poet is established at the center of Being and, as it were, sets the wheel of Love turning. And even while it remains immobile in bewilderment (*sargashta-i pábarjá*) his heart nonetheless spins about in all directions like the needle of a compass. Having become in this way a visionary witness to this play of love, he is the outlet where "the twin tresses of the Eternal Beloved" (*sar-zulfayn-i yár*) are united. It follows that this witnessing is a cosmic vision (*did-i jahánbin*) which contemplates the play of the cycle of Love turning without respite in the instantaneous succession of a presence that is also, for Háfiz, a co-presence in this Play; and a co-attendance at the cosmogonic events of the genesis of the world; that is to say, an act of foundation. For in being present at the first cosmogonic events, the poet is not merely present at these events but, participating in this act, he lays the foundations, through his word, of the world, and assumes a demiurgic role. "Come," he says, "let us split apart the domed ceiling of the celestial spheres, and let us lay the foundation of a new structure.» It is by virtue of the nature of this copresence at, and co-foundation of, the first events that the poet peoples with symbols the visionary space that blossoms, like a primordial lotus, between *azal* and *abad*.

Háfiz is unquestionably the most original of all philosophical poets. He never turns his gaze from the primeval focus whence all inspiration comes to him; every glance for him is a glance only insofar as it opens like a magic lamp in the Niche of Prophetic Lights; every drunkenness is drunkenness only insofar as it drinks deep of the wine of the primordial tavern; every head of hair is a head of hair only insofar as the waving chain of its tresses binds up again and commemorates the alliance of the primordial Pact (*'ahd-i alast*); every morning breeze is a breeze only insofar as it brings to us a fragrant breath from the Quarter of the Friend (*kúy-i dúst*). All his attention, his joy, his senses are tense for the space of that unique moment that is granted where every light is a divine theophany, every cup of wine a reflection of the Face of the Beloved, as well as the form of the azure bowl of the sky; every remembrance a reactualization of the primordial memory. His whole soul is present in this sacred space where being is mythogenesis and the event an archetypal act in the dawn of the eternal beginning. And it is as a Seer casting his gaze over the "garden of the world" (*bágh-i jahán*) that he would gather, "thanks to the hand of the pupil of his eye, a flower from the Face of the Beloved."

The eye of the poet, illuminated by the eye of the Beloved, sees in this garden the world unveiling itself as the dazzling face of the Beloved, and also becoming clouded over like its dusky hair that darkens its splendence and makes it appear like "darkened day" (*rúz-i tárik*). This oscillation between Beauty's

occultation and self-revelation and its self-revelation and occultation, is conveyed in a number of Háfiz's ghazals by the "Night of Separation" (shab-i hijrán) and the "Day of Union" (rúz-i wasl); for every separation is great with an imminent union, and every union potentially conceals a separation. This succession of repulsion and attraction, which mutually provoke each other, engenders the dialectic movement of Love, and the ascent of nostalgia that permeates all Persian mystical poetry. Here are some examples from Háfiz:

How am I to spread my wing in the span of thy Union,  
For its feathers are shed already in the nest of separation.

And in another place:

In this dark night I have lost the path of the quest.  
Come, then, O star that guides us.  
Go where I may, my anguish does but grow—  
Beware this desert, this endless road.

### The Aesthetic Coordinates of the Visionary World

Let us see now how Háfiz goes about furnishing this space which opens up between azal and abad; what, in other words, are the aesthetic consequences of this visionary topography. It goes without saying that we shall scarcely be able to analyze the whole bewitching aesthetic of his poetic world; but we may try to reveal some themes, some modalities of his expression.

Let us say at the outset that the visionary space between azal and abad comprehends the entire topography of Being itself; that is to say, the ontological hierarchy of the superimposed worlds: the jabarút as well as the malakút, the world of Archetypal Images, of which Henry Corbin has spoken, as well as the world of sensible phenomena. But for Háfiz, who is a mystic and above all a poet, the question is posed not in terms of conceptual explication but in the form of poetic licence, and by the elaboration of a whole magic of symbolic forms suited to convey the polyvalence of what, to the last, remains ineffable, beyond any form of expression. In Háfiz, all things come together to translate the untranslatable, to express the inexpressible, and to do this, he has recourse not only to the structure of the ghazal itself—which unfolds itself like concentric circles progressively amplifying at each reprise the resonance of spiritual states, and which, because of its drastic limits, demands a polishing of thought to the point of transparency—but Háfiz exploits to the full all the virtuosités and subtleties of the Persian language, such as pairs of opposites, correlative terms, word play, homonyms, etymological contrivances, rhythmical alliterations, cadenced assonances, so enhancing the webs of symbols which each reflect.

There is in the first place a whole constellation of visual images connected with divine Beauty; symbolized by the most alluring features of the Eternal Feminine, such as the flowing locks which by a backward movement, like the arc of ascent, bind the lover once more to the initial place where the first knot, the first lock of that hair, is tied; and this lock is an Alliance (paymán) that the poet vows never to betray or turn aside from. The eyebrows of the Beloved symbolize sometimes the arched prayer-niche (mihráb-i-abrú); sometimes the bow which lets loose the arrows of her lashes; sometimes the arched roof of the temple of vision of pre-eternity; that is to say, before the ceiling of the vault of heaven had yet been set in its place. The beauty-spot is in keeping with the unitary vision of the world. This "black point" is, the poet says, "but the image of thy beauty-spot in the garden of vision."

Each narration of which is taken up in a new and hitherto unexpressed form, since it recounts the story of a unique soul in search of its Beloved. Háfiz says:

The nostalgia of Love is always one and the same story,

But at every hearing it is made new.

But this story goes back to the "story" of an original recital, to a first revelation:

Behind the mirror I have been made to be like the parrot:

I repeat what the Lord of pre-eternity has ordered me to say.

Just as every vision is illuminated at the Niche of Prophetic Lights, as every hearing is a hearkening to the original Utterance, as every story of love is a differentiated, particularized version of this same original Utterance, so each presence at the first event is also the remembrance of an alliance whose prolonged echoes constitute the chain of memory, and which the illusory attraction of the world often makes us forget. All of the senses: touch, sight, taste, and, in particular, smell (because the recollective powers of this latter are singularly evocative), are combined in extremely subtle, finely shaded proportions in order to awaken, each in its own way, the memory of the Friend, like the sound of bells of the caravan in the desert, the aromatic musk of the Tartary gazelle, the exquisite aroma of wine, the sweet balm strewn by the messenger wind, so that the fragrant sap of his memory pervades the whole soul of the poem and creates that almost magical space in which images, whatever sensible object they belong to, coincide synchronically to weave the web of this immemorial memory.

If the world is impregnated with the memory of the Friend, this memory is also the recollection of a drunkenness, of a cup drunk in pre-eternity within the primordial Tavern:

Last night I saw the angels knocking at the tavern door,

Modelling the clay of man, becoming drunk with the original wine;

The inhabitants of the sacred enclosure and of the divine malakut

Drank from one cup with me, the pilgrim.

If then the angels have mixed the clay of man with the wine of mercy, man carries within himself the quintessence of that first drunkenness and, drinking from the cup in the tavern of the Magi, he does but receive from the cup-bearer what was destined for him from the beginning. But to receive that which was from all time due to us is tantamount to assuming our destiny; it is also tantamount to commemorating the act by virtue of which it was destined for us. It follows from this that the entire universe becomes a tavern fragrant with the wine of merciful Being; and all creatures, all the "drunken ones" of the tavern of the Magi, are like so many cups, and each of them receives, according to the capacity which is his lot, a drop of that delicious drink; and the drunkenness from that drink lasts until the resurrection. As Háfiz says:

Whoever has drunk like me a draught from the cup of the Friend

Shall not become sober until the dawn of resurrection.

The images relating to the tavern, to cups, to the cup-bearer, are so many symbols which, grafted on to the æsthetic ground of the Eternal Feminine, give rise to this erotico-mystic and Bacchic symbolism of the poet of Shiraz, which is so alluring, and which (alas!) often leads to shallow and hedonist interpretations of his poetry. That there is no antagonism between the earthly wine and the divine wine, just as there is none between profane love and the love of God, since one is the necessary initiation to the other, is what Háfiz intends to show. He not only exalts sensible beauty and "earthly nourishment," he transmutes them, thanks to the incantation of his word, into á divine and fantastic banquet at which angels become cup-bearers drunk with love, like those ravishing and lascivious nymphs we admire in the form of apsáras in the Buddhist grottoes at Ajanta and Ellora.

All these different modalities of sensible expression: sight, hearing, taste, as well as smell, converge, finally, in the memory of an event which is a sort of alliance which itself constitutes man, as well as his destiny. What then is the meaning of this Alliance to which we have referred? Háfiz says:

The heavens could not bear the burden of this Charge (bár-i amánat)  
And the winning lot, the Trust, falls to me, the fool.

This Lot is the burden of the Charge (amánat) entrusted to man at the beginning; man is, in other words, the repository of the universality of the Names and Attributes, in accordance with this quranic verse, which says:

We offered [the Trust] to the heavens, to the earth and to the mountains. They refused to take it upon themselves and they were afraid of it; and man assumed it for he is dark (zalúman) and ignorant (jahúlan). (Qur'an 33:72)

And in the exegesis of the mystics this means: we offered the repository of the universal to Heaven, symbolizing the Spirits, to Earth, representing material bodies, and to the Mountains, symbolizing the world of Archetypal Images; we appealed to their ontological fitness, but they set themselves against it, being unfit to do it, while man had the capacity; that is to say, according to Háfiz, he was foolish enough to take on a responsibility that the entire universe refused.

Háfiz's openness to the space of memory, as well as his witnessing of events which are so mingled with the mythical dawn of every beginning, work in such a way that the poet, while still in this world, is beleaguered by another world, and while still captive in the snare of illusions, he remains nonetheless the free bird of the garden of visions. This perpetual shuttle between two orders of existence, the one partaking of the free flight of the bird initiated into the "rose-garden of the sacred," and the other mingled with the lamentations of captivity, betrays a paradoxical position which remains inherent in the ambivalent situation of the Seer himself. The poet knows that he belongs to the world of malakút, that there is his dwelling-place, the more so as all the epiphanies he contemplates unceasingly invite him there; but he also knows that he has fallen into the cage of earthly existence. Now and then the poet acknowledges his powerlessness to take his flight towards the vertiginous heights.

How shall I turn within the space of the world of Sanctity

Since in the alcove of combination [of elements] I remain nailed to my body.

The effect of the oscillating position of Háfiz between the world of sanctity and the fall into "time" is that his position expresses on the plane of the spatial movement of the poetic vision that which at the ethical level of gnosis remains the paradoxical status of the liberated sage. The poet remains suspended between two manners of apprehending things: having one foot in the other world and one foot in this world; it is with the eschatological bias of the former that he will see this world unfolding itself before his eyes. That is, the time of the poet's presence lies between abad and azal and is therefore an unveiling; but to this visionary time-space Háfiz opposes a horizontal, linear time which runs between the two shores of the world.

From shore to shore the host of darkness stretches,

Prom azal to abad opens the dervishes' respite.

His paradoxical situation comes precisely from the crossing of these two times, one of which flows out into post-eternity (abad) completing the cycle of Being, while the other establishes the horizon of becoming on the linear plane. It is with regard to this horizontal time that the world is a lure, an illusion, a snare; and to emphasize all this futile trumpery, Háfiz uses the image of the new bride.

The world in its outward form is like a new bride,

But whoever cleaves to it offers his life as dowry.

Or again, the world is a ravishing bride, but be warned that this "chaste and modest one becomes the bride of none;" and her infidelity knows no limit. These negative aspects of the world, likened to

infidelity, to inconstancy, to the fleeting attractions of a beauty which is, alas, evanescent, are connected with guile, with deceit, because this world, despite

Plying bride (*`arús*), is nonetheless an old woman (*`ajúz*), all wrinkled, full craft and cunning and who, weaving insidious intrigues, catches creatures in the mesh of her snare; lending herself to all and giving herself to ne, "an old woman with a thousand lovers" (*`ajuz-i hazár amid*). In ort, the world is a piece of wizardry, a trick of the conjuror and the Illusionist (*shu`bada*). And the more the abyss of this world is revealed to e poet, the more burning becomes his desire to escape from it, and the ore raging his thirst to return to his original home.

Where are the tidings of the Union, that I with all my soul may take the leap?

I am the bird of the Holy places, could I but leap outside the snare of this world.

This desire for transcendence is at times so irresistible, his ardor so Wet-flowing, that Háfiz not only wants to shatter the glass of confinement, break down the walls of all the prisons, but goes so far as to overstep the frontiers of the resurrection itself, now too narrow to contain the super Abundant ecstasy of a soul who wants to break the cosmic egg, to rend the ceiling of the celestial sphere, "in order to lay there the foundations of a new building."

### The Paradoxical Ethos of the Inspired Libertine (*rend*)

Now what is the ethical behavior of the possessor of the cup of Jam? It is here that the notion of *rend* comes in, that untranslatable term that we render indifferently by "inspired libertine," while taking care to underline the inadequacy of this translation; for "the most untranslatable words," says Charles du Bos, "are those that mean most." The word *rend*, as Háfiz understands it, sums up the complex and unique traits of the psychology of the Persian. If, in the words of Berdyayev, Dostoevsky illustrates more than any other Russian thinker the "metaphysical hysteria" of the Russian soul, the *rend* of Háfiz is the most evocative symbol of the indefinable ambiguity of the Persian character; an ambiguity that often confuses not only Westerners but also the other peoples of the Orient. The term is liable, because of its polyvalent cultural content, to interpretations on many levels, which are often contradictory, indeed paradoxical; all the more so because it implicitly contains its ugly side. These conflicting senses are always resolved when they are reintegrated into the initial constellations to which they all belong.

In this term we find the differing tendencies of the Persian character: its suppleness, its power of adaptation which is not necessarily opportunism, but an art of balance and of "shrinking," as Confucius so aptly put it; however, detached from its original sense, this word can come to mean opportunism. This term also evokes a lively lucidity, a *savoir faire*, a refinement of action, a tact that goes all the way to compliance, a discretion in speech, which are neither craft, nor hypocrisy, nor an affectation of mystery; but can, outside their context, become those very things, being reduced to insidious shifts, not to say to dissembling and imposture. Again, this term denotes an interior liberty, an authentic detachment from the things of this world, suggesting the deliverance, in however small a measure, of the man who lays himself open without shame, naked to the mirror of the world, degenerated from its primitive context, this attitude can turn into one of exhibitionism, of posing, and of mere libertinism. Equally in this concept we find a sense of immoderacy, a behavior out of the ordinary, shocking, scandalous.

This term expresses, further, a predilection for the uncertain, for language that is veiled and masked, for hints and insinuations, which in the authentic *rend* are expressed in inspired paradoxes (*shathiyát*), in the discipline of the arcane (*taqiya*); but deflected away from its original meaning, it ends in thunderous, puffed-up discourses, and at times in plain falsehood. Finally, there is in this concept a boundless love of

the divine such as we see in the great thinkers and mystics of Iranian spirituality; but detached from its mystical content, it is transformed into fanaticism and steered by homines magni, to the psychology of the mob. These are the positive qualities of this whole ethic of conduct, almost indecipherable for the non-Persian, with the exception perhaps of the Chinese, that we find in Háfiz's concept of rend.

The rend, annihilated in the Essence and attaining to subsistence in God, is reborn at the level of the first events and rediscovers the world with the eye with which the Hidden Treasure, unveiling itself, brings to light the magical play of its Beauty. This disinterested gaze of the rend, which is also the gaze of the Divine itself, Háfiz calls nazarbáz a term every bit as difficult to translate as the word rend itself. Translated literally gives, "he who plays with his gaze." In defining his own vision Háfiz adds:

I am the lover ('áshiq), the rend, the nazarbáz, I own it in all candor,

That you may know the manifold arts with which I am adorned.

These multiple arts have a common denominator, which is the art par excellence of the one possessed of cosmic vision; but they nevertheless express the various modalities of an extremely subtly-shaded truth. Seen from the perspective of dialectic Love, this art is the art of the lover in quest of union with the Beloved; considered from the point of view of ethical conduct it will be simply the art of the inspired libertine, whose provocative, scandalous attitude shocks the narrow-minded, breaking the barren charm of conformity with which people called "rational" hem themselves in; and as seen by the interpreter of the "science of the gaze" (nazar), this art will be the magical art of "the one who is possessed of the art of the gaze" (sáhib-i nazar).

If the divine face becomes the epiphany of your gaze,

There is no doubt that now you are possessed of the gaze.

To play with one's gaze means not to apprehend the world as an object or an idea, but as an unveiling. Not to see the world as object, is also not to represent it as something out there, laid out in front of us, but to discover it as something opening spontaneously, suddenly before us, like the unveiling within ourselves of a flower in blossom. If the nazarbáz knows and sees that this unfolding is a Play of the divine gaze, it is because his gaze is a Play which has for stake the Play for which the Treasure puts forth its bewitching spell. "It is upon the magical Play of thy gaze," says Háfiz, "that we laid the foundation of our being." Now, to be co-witness of the magical play of the divine gaze is also to free oneself from the hold of the two worlds.

I say it in all candor and am pleased with what I say, Being the slave of Love, I am freed from the two worlds.

It is the union, or the annihilating experience in the Majesty of the essence, and subsistence in its Attributes, which permits the poet to reach the level of the Play, and to be co-witness of the space where this Play unveils itself. It is because of this effacement in this eruption out of the cycle of Being that the poet, tying again the two extremities of the two arcs, in the configuration projected by his gaze, reflects back as the point of coincidence, recomposing and founding again the center and circumference and the pivot which support the axis of the world and the space where the Play of the world opens up. This co-witnessing of the space of the Play is possible only through a surrender of the will, an abandonment to the Play of the divine magic, seeing that it is on the very gratuitousness of this Play that the poet has founded the edifice of his being, and has totally abandoned himself to it.

On the circle of Destiny we are the point of surrender,

That your thought may be all grace, your beginning all order.

If the surrender is an unreserved abandonment to the Play and to the space where this Play unveils itself, it is also, on the plane of consciousness, a non-thought, a stripping away of all that is other than His

thought, and on the plane of the will, a non-willing: that is to say, an emptying of all volition which would oppose itself to the bounteous freedom of this Play.

The thought and will of the self have no existence in our vision [the vision of the rends]:

The vision and will of selfhood are sacrilege in our religion.

It is armed now with this ethic of non-willing, and supplied with the vision of non-thought, which together constitute the true religion of the rends, that Háfiz so relentlessly unlooses himself, with a rare audacity that makes him one of the greatest protesters in the history of the world against the prohibition-mongers, the inquisitors, the accusers, the preachers, the tradesmen of gnosis, who in the name of symbols devoid of all content, of 'reigion reduced to a commerce in souls, distill the venom of their blindness, who inwardly are as empty as a drum and destitute of all true sorrow. They are precisely the ones who, in making the Qur'an the "snare of hypocrisy" (dám-i tazwir), remain outside the religion of love.

Speak not to the accusers about the mysteries of Love and of drunkenness,

Since you suffer no pain why do you want Him to heal you?

It is the authenticity of this suffering which binds man to the root of Being, which is lacking in the inconscient (bi-khabar), the rationalists ('áqil), the false ascetics, the sanctimonious (záhid), whose inauthenticity Háfiz deplores:

The inconscient are dumbfounded by the play of our gaze.

I am as I appear; it is for them to play their role.

The rationalists are the [fixed] point of the compass of Being,

But Love knows well that their head turns round within this circle.

The inauthenticity of the "inconscient" is not limited solely to certain individuals but represents an entire category of people who, because they take pleasure in the narrow framework of their "selfhood vision" and believe themselves to be the center of the compass of being, do not know that they are drawn along on it by the whirlwind of Love; in other words, they do not know that it is Love that turns the circle; and so they remain outside that religion of love whose champion Háfiz became, pushing to its most extreme consequences a dispute as old as the world; a dispute which has from time immemorial, and particularly in Persian literature, set in opposition the tolerant generosity of the liberated thinker and the obsessional meanness of those who think they possess the truth. Háfiz exposes not only a narrow spirit that he styles the narcissistic selfhood-vision, not only a reductionist ethic that he denounces as a snare of hypocrisy, but also and above all a fiction which consists of taking desires for reality.

Lord forgive the warring of the seventy-two nations,

For not having seen the truth they have steeped themselves in a fiction.

Fiction (afsána) is precisely that screen of prejudices and fixed views which the inconscient project upon the unfathomable depth of what at the deepest level remains a disinterested play of the world: in short all the deceptive appearances which make inauthenticity into a solemn act of self-justification.

In contrast to this, the paradoxical attitude of the rend conveys on the ethical, human plane a truth which suffers no limit, no constraint, no repression, be it ever so justified in the eyes of the oldest tradesmen in the world, that is to say religion's prohibition-mongers. Every repression is necessarily a falsehood, a constraint which shackles the spontaneous play of the blossoming of the art of the vision; it is a constraint upon others and upon the censor himself, indeed it is the dark side of that which, driven back, reappears showing its other face:

Those preachers who from the height of their pulpits sparkle in their sermons,  
 When back at home devote themselves to business of a different sort. I have a difficulty, and  
 submit it to the wise men of this assembly: Those who exhort to penitence, why aren't they  
 penitents themselves? One would say that no longer believing in the day of the last judgment,  
 They corrupt, by their fraud, the work of the supreme Judge.

To corrupt the work of the supreme Judge is to interfere in the natural course of things, it is to judge  
 men, it is, again, to curtail the free spontaneity of man; for is it not in him that the universality of the  
 divine Names and Attributes is manifested? Who then, Háfiz asks us, could "discern good from evil  
 behind the veil (of multiplicity)?" Sin is for the poet never moral vice: it is instead every constraint that  
 encourages falsity, every fetter which would close an interior door, which would level one of the many  
 dimensions of this mystery that is man; which would lead to the trap, to the futility of empty reputation,  
 to the suffocating limits of an idea, to the absence in life of the suffering of Love, to the sclerosis of  
 everyday life; in short, all that could cause us to remain outside that religion of love, that original religion  
 that we receive as the "heritage of our primordial nature" (miráth-i fitrat). Sin is, in the final reckoning,  
 every action which would betray this primordial nature, which would be false to it, and which would  
 thwart the spontaneous flowering of its Play.

Though on all sides I am drowned in the sea of sin,  
 Being Love's initiate, I am a guest in the house of Mercy.

Let us take an actual example, the closing down of the taverns and the cabarets. This is a so-called  
 hygienic measure which right-minded censors willingly permit themselves in order to reduce sinners to  
 an arid and austere regime of penitence. But this measure has for Háfiz a two-fold baneful consequence:  
 it is, on the one hand, the closing of a door and, considering the quality of the man who instigates it, the  
 closing of an interior dimension, reduced now to the "selfhood vision" of the censor's own narrowness  
 of heart; and, on the other hand, this closing necessarily coincides with the opening of another door,  
 which is that of falsity, of deceit, of hypocrisy; and Háfiz says in this regard:

If only the doors of the taverns could be reopened again,  
 If only the knots of their repressive measures could be untied.  
 If by the blind conceit of the pious they are shut,  
 Be patient, for thanks to the love of God they will be opened again.  
 By the purity of the rends, these dawn drinkers,  
 Numberless doors will be opened by the key of prayers.  
 They are closing the doors of the taverns,  
 O my God do not give your approval,  
 For it is the door of hypocrisy they are opening.

The act as such has no absolute value for Háfiz; even blasphemy and sacrilege change their sense  
 according to whether they are envisaged from the point of view of the cosmic vision of the wise man, or  
 from the point of view of the limiting blinkers of the bigots who only project the screen of their own  
 unwillingness; that is to say that every action is bad only if it is grounded in a narrow mind; captive in the  
 nets of the fiction of the world. To the visionary gaze of the rend who is free from all attachment, of all  
 alienating thought, whose heart is polished like a mirror, and who has made his ablutions, like Háfiz  
 himself, in the shining spring of Love, wine, for example, not only is not defiling but is rather the elixir of  
 deliverance, and it is in the purple substance of this purifying drink that the poet soaks his prayer-mat.  
 For every inwardly pure being longs for the Friend, it little matters whether he is a sinner or a virtuous  
 man, one who drinks to the dregs, a drunkard or one awakened. And it is also from this original purity  
 that Háfiz's tolerance flows: a tolerance which is not to be taken in the usual sense in which we use this  
 word, but which is a deliverance so fundamental, so original, so far removed from the taints and



defilements of prejudices, of beliefs, of confessions and of sects, that it appears as a cleansing spring, obliterating at last all the chimeras that men make for themselves

And I shall leave the last word to the poet of Shiraz himself:

Do not judge the reeds, you who boast your purity —  
 No one will indict you for the faults of others.  
 What is it to you whether I am virtuous or a sinner?  
 Busy yourself with yourself!  
 Each in the end will reap the seed he himself has sown.  
 Every man longs for the Friend, the drunkard as much as the awakened.  
 Every place is the House of Love, the Synagogue as much as the Mosque. <>

## **LIGHT UPON LIGHT: ESSAYS IN ISLAMIC THOUGHT AND HISTORY IN HONOR OF GERHARD BOWERING** edited by Jamal J. Elias, Bilal Orfali [Islamic History and Civilization, Brill, 9789004409941]

**LIGHT UPON LIGHT: ESSAYS IN ISLAMIC THOUGHT AND HISTORY IN HONOR OF GERHARD BOWERING** brings together studies that explore the richness of Islamic intellectual life in the pre-modern period. Leading scholars around the world present nineteen studies that explore diverse areas of Islamic Studies, in honor of a renowned scholar and teacher: Professor Dr. Gerhard Bowering (Yale University). The volume includes contributions in four main areas: (1) Quran and Early Islam; (2) Sufism, Shi'ism, and Esotericism; (3) Philosophy; (4) Literature and Culture. These areas reflect the enormous breadth of Professor Bowering's contributions to the field over a lifetime of scholarship, teaching, and mentoring.

Contributors: Hussein Ali Abdulsater, Mushegh Asatryan, Shahzad Bashir, Jonathan Brockopp, Yousef Casewit, Jamal Elias, Janis Esots, Li Guo, Matthew Ingalls, Tariq Jaffer, Mareike Koertner, Joseph Lumbard, Matthew Melvin-Koushki, Mahan Mirza, Bilal Orfali, Gabriel Reynolds, Nada Saab, Amina Steinfels & Alexander Treiger.

Contents

Preface

Publications by Gerhard Bowering

Notes on Contributors

PART I

Quran and Early Islam

1 Scholarship and Folklore? A Comparison of the Earliest Sources: 'Urwa b. al-Zubayr and Wahb b. al-Munabbih by Mareike Koertner

2 The Rise of Islam in a Judeo-Christian Context by Jonathan E. Brockopp

3 Biblical Turns of Phrase in the Quran by Gabriel Said Reynolds

4 The Interpretation of the Covenant Verse in Classical Imami Theology by Hussein Ali Abdulsater

5 Kitāb intizā'āt al-Qur'ān al-'azīm: A Compendium of Quranic Quotations Attributed to the Fatimid Secretary Abū l-Qāsim 'Alī Ibn al-Ṣayrafī (d. 542/1147) by Bilal W. Orfali

PART 2

## Sufism, Shi'ism, and Lettrism

6 Risālahī l-ṣifāt wa-`ilm al-tawḥīd: A Sufi Treatise Attributed to Abū Sa`īd Aḥmad b. `Īsā al-Kharrāz (d. 286/899) by Nada Saab

7 Shi'i Literature in the Late Ninth Century: Ishāq al-Aḥmar al-Nakha'ī (d. 286/899) and His Writings by Mushegh Asatryan

8 The Treatise on the Ascension (al-Risāla al-mi`rājiyya): Cosmology and Time in the Writings of Abū l-Ḥasan al-Shushtarī (d. 668/1269) by Yousef Casewit

9 The Image of Qalandar in the Dīvān-i Shams by Janis Esots

10 Pseudo-Shaykh Bahā'ī on the Supreme Name, a Safavid-Qajar Lettrist Classic by Matthew Melvin-Koushki

11 Sufism and Islamic Identity in Jalaluddin Rumi's Anatolia by JamalJ. Elias

12 India as a Sufi Spacetime in the Work of Jamālī of Delhi by hahzad Bashir

## PART 3

## Philosophy

13 Knowledge on Display: Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī's Universal Compendium by Amina M. Steinfels

14 Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī's Taxonomy of Extraordinary Acts by TariqJaffer

15 Believing Is Seeing: The Universe in the Eyes of al-Bīrūnī and Ibn Sīnā by Mahan Mirza

16 Al-Ghazālī's Philosophical Soteriology by Alexander Treiger

17 Abū Ḥāmid al-Ghazālī and the Art of Knowing by Joseph Lumbard

## PART 4

## Literature and Culture

18 Religious Satire in the Maqāmāt of al-Hamadhānī by Matthew Ingalls

19 Doctrinal Anxiety and Social Reality regarding Music and Dance in Mamluk Cairo: Ibn al-Ḥājj on al-Samā', To Sing or Not: The Case against Music by I Guo

Index of Arabic and Persian Terms

Index of Proper Names

Excerpt: Gerhard Bowering was born on October 1939 in Würzburg, Germany, right at the beginning of the Second World War. His father was taken prisoner during the war (to be released in 1947), and his family lost its home in the bombings of March 1945, when 90 percent of Würzburg was destroyed in 17 minutes. He, along with his parents, two brothers, and two sisters, then moved in with his grandparents until his family were able to reestablish their home in Würzburg.

After finishing school in his home town and completing his Abitur (high school) in 1959, Gerhard Bowering entered the Jesuit order on September 14, 1959. He first came into direct contact with the Islamic world when he hitch-hiked through Morocco that summer. He studied philosophy in Munich from 1961 until 1964, receiving his Lizentiat. Immediately after finishing university, he went to Pakistan, where he lived from 1964 to 1967, first studying Urdu in Lahore, and then teaching high school in a village in Punjab province. It was in Pakistan that he was ordained as a Catholic priest, on May 5, 1970. He continued his studies at the University of Montreal (1967–1970), where he studied theology, after which he enrolled in 1970 in a doctoral program at McGill University to study Islamic studies, including Arabic and Persian. McGill was a highly regarded center for Islamic studies at the time, and he studied with renowned scholars such as Professor Hermann Landolt (who served as his dissertation advisor), Professor Charles Adams, Professor Toshihiko Izutsu, and Professor Donald Little.

Gerhard Bowering received his doctorate from McGill in 1975, but he had already begun teaching in the Department of Religious Studies at the University of Pennsylvania the previous year. He taught there from 1974 to 1984, first as an assistant professor and, from 1981, as an associate professor. He joined the Department of Religious Studies at Yale University with the rank of professor in 1984, where he has been teaching ever since.

He has devoted himself to the study of medieval Sufism and has written a remarkable number of books and articles, influencing generations of scholars in the field. Even so, he has frequently branched out of this area, including as the editor of *The Princeton Encyclopedia of Islamic Political Thought* (Princeton, 2013). His book on the early Sufi figure Sahl al-Tustarī (d. 283/896), *The Mystical Vision of Existence in Classical Islam: The Qur'ānic Hermeneutics of the Sūfī Sahl at-Tustarī* (Berlin and New York, 1980), represents a benchmark in the study of Sufi thought in relation to the Quran. He went on to edit numerous important works on Sufi thought, including, to mention a few, *The Minor Qur'ān Commentary of Abū 'Abd al-Raḥmān Muḥammad b. al-Ḥusayn al-Sulamī* (Beirut, 1995), born out of Bowering's lifelong affection for the thinking of Abū 'Abd al-Raḥmān al-Sulamī (d. 412/1020). Together with Bilal Orfali, he also edited al-Sulamī's most important treatises, in *Sufi Treatises of Abū 'Abd al-Raḥmān al-Sulamī* (Beirut, 2009), as well as *Sufi Inquiries and Interpretations of Abū 'Abd al-Raḥmān al-Sulamī* (Beirut, 2010). Also together with Orfali, he edited an important treatise of Abū Khalaf al-Ṭabarī (d. ca. 470/1077) in *The Comfort of the Mystics: A Handbook and Anthology of Sufism* (Leiden, 2012) as well as its abridgement, *Seeking Solitude: A Short Sufi Guidebook*, a critical Arabic text edition and analysis of *Khalwat al-'āḳifīn* (Beirut, 2013). Most recently, together with Yousef Casewit, he edited the *Ṭiqāḥ al-ḥikma bi-aḥkām al-'ibra* of the Andalusian scholar Ibn Barraġān (d. 536/1141) as *A Qur'ān Commentary by Ibn Barraġān of Seville* (Leiden, 2016). In addition to these volumes, he is the author of approximately 100 articles appearing in several languages and on four continents. Many of these are important articles in major encyclopedias dealing with the Islamic world (including the *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, the *Encyclopedia Iranica*, and the *Encyclopedia of the Qur'an*). As such, Gerhard Bowering has had an important impact on shaping knowledge in the broad fields of Sufism and Quranic studies, and on determining the course of study of innumerable junior scholars.

Gerhard Bowering has been a member of the American Philosophical Society since 1994, received a Guggenheim Fellowship in 2005–2006, and was a visiting fellow at the Institute of Advanced Study, Princeton, in 1992. He served as a visiting professor in Princeton University (1984) and Innsbruck University, Austria (1992), and also was a research fellow at the American Research Centers of Egypt and Turkey (1981–1982). He is the recipient of the ACLS Best Book Prize in the History of Religion (1981), the Henry Allen Moe Prize in the Humanities, Princeton (1997), and the Book Prize of Iran, awarded in 2017.

The training and mentoring of emerging scholars has been one of the greatest achievements of Gerhard Bowering's professional life. Starting with his time at the University of Pennsylvania and continuing during his years at Yale University, Professor Bowering has dedicated a significant portion of his time and energy to training graduate students. As a result, it is probable that Bowering has trained more students than any other advisor of his generation in the field. Many of them have gone on to distinguished careers of their own, such that he can rightly be called "Ustād tarāsh" (the carver of teachers), following the example of the great Sufi figure Najm al-Dīn Kubrā (d. 618/1221), the Walī tarāsh (carver of saints), on whom he continues to work. The number of students who have successfully

completed doctorates under his direction is so large that the editors of this volume decided to limit the essays in this festschrift to his students, a fitting tribute to a man who has been as much a teacher as a researcher. <>

## Essay: Sufism and Islamic Identity in Jalaluddin Rumi's Anatolia by Jamal J. Elias

### Introduction

The Sufi poet and teacher Mawlana Jalaluddin Rumi, the founder of the Mevlevi (Mawlawi) order, enjoys wide popularity among Muslims and non-Muslims alike. Reading his poetry selectively and sometimes in impressionistic translations, his modern admirers construct images of him that reflect their own religious values and aspirations. Such imaginings of Rumi are not new, however, since the textual construction of his image began very shortly after his death in 672/1273. More than in the case of most other Sufi groups, the Mevlevi order has been shaped by memories of its founder, whose poetry, prose treatises, and letters, complemented by biographical accounts of him, are used to construct the order as a distinct neo-religious group, with Rumi as a founder figure, his poetry as scripture, and the Mevlevis as its adherents.

The Mevlevis take their name from Rumi's honorific title of Mawlānā (Persian) or Mevlāna (Turkish). It was shortly after his death that the sobriquet "Rumi" ("the Roman" or "the Anatolian") gained popularity, identifying him with Anatolia, where he spent his adult life and where his legacy is centered, although Mevlevi sources themselves frequently refer to him as "Balkhi," after the region of Afghanistan for which he came.

In this essay I focus on the *Manāqib al-ʿārifin*, the most important biographical work on Rumi and his immediate circle. Through a close reading of the text, I explore what it meant to be Muslim to these very influential Sufis in the premodern Turco-Persian world. In discussions of religious normativism, heterodoxy vs. orthodoxy, or heteropraxy vs. orthopraxy, observers sometimes lose sight of the fact that the majority of religious movements consider themselves normative, orthodox, and orthoprax. Yet, much scholarship on Islam either does not take this into account or, if it does, does not explore the implications of a reoriented view of normativity in religious thought and history. The problem is particularly acute when a propensity to place hadith and fiqh at the center of the religion makes us treat socially, politically, and demographically dominant phenomena as peripheral or nonnormative. Put differently, for much of Islamic history and in the majority of its cultural contexts, those in authority and the majority of the population articulated complex notions of religion and frequently looked to different hierarchies of religious authority than the traditional *ulamā'*, yet the *ulamā'* are routinely treated as the sole representatives of Muslim normativity. By examining how religion is represented, and particularly how the written materials discussed here treat conversion and depict non-Muslims in relation to Muslims, I explore some problematic aspects of the concept of normativity and demonstrate how being Muslim in "Rumi's path" was viewed as normative in a particular social and historical context.

### Introducing Anatolia

The region under consideration—central Anatolia in the latter half of the seventh/thirteenth century—was a time and place in transition and flux. The major migrations of Muslim Turcoman pastoral nomads into Anatolia and Azerbaijan were complete by this time, but Anatolia was still very much a Muslim frontier when compared to its eastern and southern neighbors: Iran, Iraq, and Syria. In many respects,

Anatolia figured prominently in the imagination of many Muslims: in addition to a substantial body of literature commemorating the battles on the Armenian, Georgian, and Byzantine borderlands, there was also a culture of warrior-saints (ghāzīs) and of other religious figures encouraging frontier warfare as well as competition between Muslim-ruled states.

The crusades had an impact on the fate of Anatolia, in that the devastation of Byzantium in the First and Second Crusades encouraged the Byzantines to enter into strategic, short-term alliances with Muslim principalities in central Anatolia, which strengthened the latter in such a way that they were able to wrest territory away from Christian kingdoms along the Black Sea and consolidate Islamic rule in the region. Of these, the Karamanids (6th–8th/12th–15th centuries) are especially relevant because they ruled the region of Rumi's Konya.

On the intellectual and cultural fronts, Islamic Anatolia was a major beneficiary of the Mongol invasions of the seventh/thirteenth centuries, since much of the intellectual class of Islamic Central Asia left for safer locales. They were welcomed in the regional courts of Anatolia (as they were elsewhere, such as in South Asia), where being a Persian émigré scholar carried great prestige. Rumi belonged to such a family. It was after his birth in 604/1207 in the town of Wakhsh in Tajikistan, near the more famous city of Balkh, that his father Baha' al-Din Walad, a Sunni religious scholar with Sufi affiliations, took his family west, eventually finding employment in Konya. On Baha' al-Din's death in 628/1231, Rumi inherited his father's position and retained this professorship for the remainder of his life.

### The Manāqib al-`ārifīn

Rumi had a tremendous impact on subsequent generations of Sufis, both through his own writings and through those of early members of his order. Here, I focus on the most important early work on his life and that of his immediate family, the *Manāqib al-`ārifīn* of Shams al-Din Ahmad Aflaki `Arifi. Very little reliable information is available on the life of Aflaki `Arifi (d. 761/1360) beyond what he volunteers in his work. He does not mention the circumstances of his birth or having spent any part of his childhood in Konya. Indeed, almost all the information about Aflaki is from the prime of his importance as a prominent disciple of Rumi's grandson, Ulu `Arif Chalabi (d. 720/1320), at whose behest he wrote the *Manāqib al-`ārifīn* and whom he accompanied on Ulu `Arif's travels through Anatolia and Azerbaijan. It is a testament to his devotion to Rumi's grandson that Aflaki came to be known by the nisba “`Arifi.” Given the degree to which he defined himself in relation to Rumi's family, perhaps it is no surprise that he gives almost no details about himself. Self-narration is not especially common among biographers in the medieval Islamic world. Nevertheless, in a large book full of a broad range of anecdotes and spanning three generations of a small religious group of which the author was a part, it is still noteworthy that the *Manāqib al-`ārifīn* yields so little information about its author.

Even Aflaki's name is of undetermined provenance. Perhaps it is a reference to a recognized talent for something metaphysical or spiritual (inasmuch as *aflākī* means “of the heavens” or “of the finite world”). On the other hand, it could also refer to his being trained as or being a practicing astronomer, although there is no written evidence to support such a hypothesis.

In short, the author of the most important biographical work on Rumi and the generations immediately preceding and following him is known almost entirely for his devotion to Rumi's family, and especially to his grandson. Aflaki mentions that he studied with a *Masnawī*-reciter (*Masnawī-khwān*) named Siraj al-Din and with two other figures, Nizam al-Din Arzanjani and `Abd al-Mu'min Toqati. There is no date given for the beginning of his *Mevlevi* association, but he was devoted to Ulu `Arif Chalabi for the entire

period of the latter's leadership of the Mevlevi order during its formative period and, after Ulu `Arif Chalabi's death, Aflaki attached himself to Ulu `Arif's half-brother, `Abid Chalabi (d. 739/1338), and subsequently to Ulu `Arif's son, Amir `Adil Chalabi (d. ca. 768/1368).<sup>6</sup> Upon his death on 29 Rajab 761/15 June 1360, Aflaki was buried in Konya.

Aflaki commenced writing the *Manāqib al-`ārifīn* in 1318 at the behest of his master `Arif, who requested a work comprising biographies of the nine individuals included in the *Manāqib*. Aflaki allegedly completed a first draft within a year and entitled it *Manāqib al-`ārifīn wa-marātib al-kāshifīn* (Feats of the knowers and stations of the revealers). He continued to revise and expand the work, however, until it was officially completed shortly before his death, maybe in the early 1350s. The *Manāqib al-`ārifīn* follows a chronological structure, with the first chapter devoted to Rumi's father, Baha' al-Din Walad; a second, shorter chapter is about Sayyid Burhan al-Din (d. 637/1239–1240), a disciple of Baha' al-Din who took over as Rumi's spiritual guide after his father's death. The third and fourth chapters focus squarely on Rumi's adult life and his relationship with his teacher, friend, and muse Shams al-Din Tabrizi. The third is the main chapter on Rumi and comprises almost half the book; the subsequent one is less about Rumi than about Shams.

The next three, relatively short, chapters deal with three of Rumi's disciples and successors, Salah al-Din Zarkub (d. 658/1258), Rumi's son, Sultan Walad (d. 712/1312), and the latter's deputy (khalīfa) Husam al-Din Chalabi (d. 683/1284). The eighth chapter on Aflaki's own master Ulu `Arif Chalabi is, in many respects, the most interesting section of the book since it recounts many events for which the author serves as an eyewitness. Individual anecdotes in this chapter are often longer than those in the previous ones, with a level of detail not encountered before. Interestingly, the ninth and final chapter (there is an appendix as well) on Ulu `Arif Chalabi's successor, Amir `Abid, is brief and lacking in the textured detail Aflaki provides in the eighth chapter.

### Sources of the *Manāqib al-`ārifīn*

In addition to Aflaki's personal access to Rumi and his family, his *Manāqib al-`ārifīn* relies on a number of textual sources, the most important of which are as follows:

- *Maqālāt-i Shams al-Din Tabrizi* (Discourses of Shams): This work comprises sayings and teachings attributed to Rumi's companion and teacher, Shams-i Tabrizi. It was supposedly put together by Shams's disciples, although little is known about them or the circumstances of the book's composition.
- The collected works of Rumi's son, Sultan Walad, entitled the *Waladnāma* or sometimes the *Ibtidā'-nāma*.
- Rumi's writings, including his correspondence, the *Fihī māfihī*, as well as poetry from the *Masnawī-yi ma`nawī* and the *Diwān-i Shams*.
- *Risāla-yi Sipahsalar dar manāqib-i ḥaẓrat-i Khudāwandigār* by Faridun ibn Ahmad Sipahsalar. The *Risāla-yi Sipahsalar* is the only biographical monograph on Rumi from that time, and much of its material appears in Aflaki's *Manāqib* in reworked form. However, the *Risāla-yi Sipahsalar* represents its own set of problems, in that it was written by someone who does not appear to have been a formal member of Rumi's inner circle yet still was an eyewitness (or a witness once

removed) to events in Rumi's life. Because of the military title "Sipāhsālār and the emphasis the author gives to administrative and political details, it is conceivable that the author was an officer married to one of the women in Rumi's family, which gave him close access to inner Mevlevi circles. There are persistent questions about the authenticity of Sipahsalar's work, although prominent scholars of medieval Iran generally accept that it dates from the period on which it purports to report.

Although often dismissed as an ahistorical document because of its overt hagiographical nature, the *Manāqib al-`ārifin* is significant because it is frequently the only source for the events it describes. Given the diverse nature of material it contains, it remains a rich book to mine for information on medieval Islamic society, politics, gender relations, and the role of Christians, as well as other topics.

## Charisma and Conversion

A key element in the real and imagined authority of Sufi masters is their ability to convince others of their religious and charismatic power and to convert them into disciples. This phenomenon is very apparent in the case of Rumi, who is noteworthy for the number of stories involving his interaction with and conversion of non-Muslims. One case related by Aflaki in the *Manāqib al-`ārifin* is of particular importance:

It is transmitted that one day, Mawlana [i.e., Rumi] went [to visit his father's tomb] with some of his companions. They saw a large number of people milling around a person, and from that group a few youths came running and shouted: "For the sake of God! They are about to execute someone! Let Mawlana intercede, for he is a young *rūmī* [Greek or Christian] boy!"

Mawlana asked: "What has he done?" They said: "He killed someone—they are retaliating."

The moment Mawlana stepped forward all the executioners and policemen lowered their heads and stood to one side. He placed his blessed cloak on [the young man]. The prefect of the city reported the details of what had happened to the Sultan of Islam, and he said: "Mawlana is the judge. Were he to ask for a city and intercede for it, he is capable of having it. Everyone is devoted to him—what does one *rūmī* matter?"

At that, the disciples grabbed [the boy] and took him to the bathhouse. After bringing him out of the bath, they brought him to the madrasa so that he received the faith at Mawlana's hand, and he became a Muslim. He was circumcised immediately, and they held a great *samā`*.

Mawlana asked: "What is your name?" He said: "Theryanus." Mawlana said: "From this day forth he will be called 'Ala' al-Din Theryanus." In the end, due to the blessings and favor of the life-giving gaze of [Rumi], he attained a rank where noble shaykhs and pious scholars were amazed by his enlightened discourse and his comportment, and they marveled at his humor and wit.

This is the longest narrative of conversion in the *Manāqib al-`ārifin* and, although it does not fit within commonly established notions of so-called "true" conversions of an ideological or doctrinal sort, be they instantaneous or over time, it is a recognizable instance of a conversion through deliverance. What is noteworthy here is that the inner motivations of the convert are not discussed at all, though one could consider his outward motivations to be obvious. As illustrated by other examples in the following pages, conversion is represented as an instantaneous act wherein the narrative is concerned less with the convert and more with the converter along with the signification of the moment of conversion.

This is clear from a second account of Theryanus's conversion given in the *Manāqib al-`ārifin*:

It is also transmitted that the godly friend, `Ala' al-Din Theryanus, was a great scoundrel and a rogue. This was when he was still a rūmī [meaning Christian in this context] and had not yet set his feet in the circle of Islam and his formal declaration of emancipation as a Muslim had not yet been documented. One night he dreamed that he was massaging Mawlana's blessed feet and rubbing them a lot. But he didn't know who or what sort of person this was. The next morning, Theryanus washed his own hands and face and, being perplexed by his dream, he set off from his village for the city. When he was midway on his route, he suddenly encountered Mawlana who said: "Hey Theryanus! How are you after last night's efforts?" The poor man let out a shout and fell unconscious.

When he returned to his senses, he didn't see anyone there. He realized that this had been the person from his dream, and he lowered his head and set out in a distressed state. A few days later, he killed a cruel and violent man, and was condemned to death. Mawlana put his blessed cloak over him and rescued him from the hands of the executioners. Theryanus immediately became a Muslim; and, thanks to [Rumi's] favor, he attained such a status that the judges and the teachers of the city ... were reduced to stammering when faced with his divine insights and they affirmed the higher truths (ḥaqā'iq) he expressed.

Theryanus's erudition is a significant factor in accounts that I will discuss later; here, I would like to highlight the multivalent use of the term rūmī, which can either be an ethnic designation (as in "Greek," "Roman," "Byzantine," or "Anatolian") or else a religious one, meaning "Christian." Furthermore, this anecdote constitutes a full-blown conversion story of a sinner marked for conversion by a saint who appears to him in a dream, confronts him with the miraculous event while he is awake, and finally delivers him from death, heralding his conversion.

Such conversion narratives are relatively rare in Islamic sources, in the sense that few go into such details of process. In the abovementioned anecdote, the focus is not on the convert Theryanus but on the converter, Rumi. Broadly speaking, medieval Muslim conversion narratives seldom emphasize spiritual salvific elements. Instead, they emphasize the Muslims' self-conception of their religion as a temporal abrogation of earlier ones, especially (though not exclusively) Judaism and Christianity. As such, conversion represents the realization of the real nature of truth by the convert and his or her turning away from an outdated or distorted understanding of reality (as distinct from turning away from falsehood or evil). Such a notion of realization as conversion is as equally applicable to wrong-thinking Muslims as it is to non-Muslims. This is clear from the way Aflaki often arranges individual narratives in the *Manāqib al-`ārifin*, pairing them in such a way that accounts of non-Muslims converting to Islam precede or follow ones of Muslims becoming followers of Rumi. In one such example, Aflaki relates the story of a Greek (rūmī) mason who was in Rumi's house; Aflaki intentionally uses the Persian term for Christian, *tarsā*, in a word play on its literal meaning of "fearful":

The companions, by way of joking, said to him: "Why don't you become a Muslim, since the religion of Islam is the best of religions?" He said: "It is almost fifty years that I have belonged to the religion of Jesus. I fear him (az ū mī tarsam) and I would be ashamed to abandon his religion." Out of nowhere, the honorable Mawlana entered through the door and stated: "The secret of faith is fear (tars). Whoever is fearful (tarsā) of God, even if he is a Christian (tarsā), he has religion and is not without religion." Then he left again. In that moment, the Christian (tarsā) mason adopted the faith and became a Muslim and, once having joined the Muslim path, he became a sincere disciple.

This is immediately followed by a story of madrasa students from Central Asia:



Similarly, one day some religious students who had come from Jand and Khojand asked: “In this world of forms (‘ālam-i šūrat) what purpose does the rat serve?” [Rumi] replied: “Nothing has taken form in the world without a wise purpose. If there was no rat, the snake would ruin the world and humankind. The rat eats the snake’s eggs and destroys them; otherwise snakes would fill the world. The explanation of the particularities that are placed in all the atoms of the world and of humankind is infinite.” They [i.e., the religious students] lowered their heads and became disciples.

Madrasa students, like traditional religious scholars (‘ulamā’), often are treated in Sufi writings as individuals who purport to possess religious knowledge but do so without actually understanding it. The account of the madrasa students is explicit in its message of conversion as a noetic experience involving receipt of a new form of knowledge. The story of the Christian mason is less explicit in this regard, but noetic conversion still figures clearly as a feature of the anecdote.

Examples of conversion through realization are common in the *Manāqib al-‘ārifīn*. One story features two Christian painters, Kaluyan and ‘Ayn al-Dawla, both of whom were disciples of Rumi:

Kaluyan related [to ‘Ayn al-Dawla] one day: “In Istanbul a picture of Mary and Jesus has been painted on a tablet which, like Jesus and Mary them selves, has no equal. Painters have come from all over the world but are not able to fashion anything like this picture.

Out of infatuation with these pictures, ‘Ayn al-Dawla undertook a journey. For a year he resided in that great monastery in Istanbul and served the monks of that place. Seeing his opportunity one night, he put the tablet under his arm and left. When he reached Konya, he had the honor of visiting Mawlana, who said: “Where have you been?” He reported the story of the tablet exactly as it had occurred. Mawlana said: “Let us gaze upon this spirit-giving tablet. It was indeed painted with great beauty and subtlety. After looking at it along time, Mawlana said: “These two beautiful images are complaining greatly about you, saying: ‘He is not sincere in his love for us—he is a false lover.’” ‘Ayn al-Dawla said: “How is this?” Mawlana replied: “They say: ‘We never sleep and eat, continually staying awake at night and fasting during the day. ‘Ayn al-Dawla deserts us at night and goes to sleep, and during the day he eats. He does not do as we do.’” ‘Ayn al-Dawla said: “Sleeping and eating are completely impossible for them, nor can they speak. They are images without a soul.”

Mawlana said: “You who are an image with a soul and know so many arts and have been fashioned by the divine artist whose handiwork is the world, Adam, and everything in the heavens and the earth—is it permissible that you abandon Him and make yourself into a lover of an image without soul and without higher meaning? What can result from such unaware images, and what profit can you acquire from them?” ‘Ayn al-Dawla repented immediately, lowered his head and became a Muslim.

This anecdote is followed immediately by the story of a devotee of Rumi’s disciple, Awhad al-Din Khu’i; that man’s son wanted to become Rumi’s disciple, and the father was concerned that this would prevent the boy from reaching God directly. Awhad al-Din advised the father to test Rumi’s spiritual stature by coming to him but not mentioning his concerns about the boy. Subsequently, when they were in a gathering with Rumi, Rumi said: “By God, by God! This boy first reached God and then became my disciple! If divine favor had not exerted an attraction on him, he would not have come running in our direction.” The account then jumps forward to relate how Awhad al-Din used to spend his time listening to Rumi recite poetry. When Rumi died, Awhad al-Din came out bareheaded, weeping, all the while saying: “Oh my dear, my dear, my dear! How have you come and gone without anyone knowing you?” Then he recited these verses:

He came to the world for two days and showed us his face

But he left so suddenly I don't know who he was.  
In this manner the gentleman (khwāja)—along with his whole family (bā  
ahl wa 'ayyāl)—became disciples.

The message of this anecdote is multifold, including providing evidence of Rumi's insight and the implicit question of whether or not devotion to a master compromises the Muslim ideal of individual connections to God. But it is primarily an account about realization, in that it is the behavior of Awhad al-Din—the father's master—at Rumi's death, coupled with a poem about Rumi's hidden nature, that reveals hidden truths to the man as well as to the rest of his family.

Another pair of anecdotes presents a different, more aesthetic or imaginal message in Rumi's teaching. The second of the pair concerns the conversion of a Jewish man:

Rumi's son said: "One day a Jew from among their rabbis encountered Mawlana. He said: 'Is our religion better or your religion?' Mawlana replied: 'Your religion.' He [the Jew] immediately became a Muslim."

The signification of this account is unclear unless one reads it in the context of the anecdote that precedes it because, together, they reinforce the idea that good behavior and taste are themselves a display of true knowledge. In the first of the pair, Rumi's son relates:

One day they asked my father: "Isn't the voice of the rabāb [rebec] a strange sound?" He replied: "It is the grating sound of the door of Paradise which we hear." Sayyid Sharaf al-Din [a traditional religious scholar who was there] said: "But we also hear the same sound; why is it that we do not become excited the way the honorable Mawlana does?" He replied: "... what we hear is the sound of that door opening, whereas what he hears is the sound of that door closing."

## The Masnawi and the Quran

Examples of Muslim conversion to the truth as taught by Rumi can be dramatic in the Manāqib al-`arīfin: In one account, a disciple of Rumi complains that learned religious scholars were arguing with him, saying: "Why is the Masnawi called the Quran?" To this the disciple had replied: "It is the commentary (tafsīr) of the Quran." When he related this incident to Rumi, the master was silent for a moment, then he burst out: "You dog! Why is it not the Quran? You ass! Why shouldn't it be so? Your sister is a whore! Why shouldn't it be so? Indeed, contained in the words of the prophets and the Sufis (awliyā') is nothing but the lights of divine mysteries. The speech of God has sprung up from their pure hearts and has flowed forth on the stream of their tongue.

Indeed speech resides within the heart  
And the tongue has been made a guide to speech.

After this Arabic couplet, Aflaki continues with words attributed to Rumi and a couplet in Persian followed by his own testimony to a conversion:

Whether it be Syriac, the first chapter of the Quran (al-sab' al-mathānī), or whether it be Hebrew or Arabic—

Be like this or that, Soul of my soul, you're my soul's soul  
Speak with any tongue you wish O Khusrow with Shirin's lips!  
When this explanation reached the ears of the religious scholars from the tongue of the possessor of insight, they all engaged in presenting apologies for their stupidity and ignorance. Having sought forgiveness, they joined the way of the companions.

As illustrated by these accounts, conversion is not only about non-Muslims becoming Muslims, but about everyone (Muslims included) becoming true Muslims. In light of the possibility of intra-Muslim conversion experiences, the way non-Muslims are represented and the roles they play are worth exploring further. One anecdote about Rumi in the *Manāqib al-`ārifīn* is related on the authority of a well-respected Christian monk who headed a monastery:

One day the honorable Mawlana came to Plato's Monastery (Dayr-i Aflatun) which stands nested in a mountain, and he went into the cave there from which cold water flows forth. He set off to penetrate to the very end of the cave. I [the monk] waited outside the cave watching to see what would happen. He sat in the middle of the cold water for seven days and nights. After that, he came outside in an excited state and departed. Truly, there was no trace of change whatsoever on his blessed body.

The monk then swore that: "What I have read about the person of the Messiah and I have observed in the sacred books of Abraham and Moses, as well as what I have seen in the histories of the elders concerning the magnitude of the physical exertions of the prophets—the very same, and even more, was in him" (emphasis added).

The corollary of this anecdote of a Christian monk testifying that Rumi is in the tradition of the prophets and the messiah is the message that Rumi could engage in Christian practices in Christian spaces and excel at them, and that Christian monks can be reliable witnesses. The notion of religious normalcy and normativity extending to include non-Muslims is found on several occasions in the *Manāqib al-`ārifīn*, one of the most important being the account of Rumi's death:

When they brought out the funeral bier, both the great and the small bared their heads. All the women, men, and children were present, and they raised a hue and cry that resembled the hue and cry of the Great Resurrection. Everyone was weeping, and most men walked along naked [probably meaning bareheaded], shouting and tearing their clothes. Likewise, all the communities (milal) with their men of religion and worldly power (aṣḥāb-i dīn wa duwal) were present, including the Christians and the Jews, the Greeks (rūmīyān), the Arabs and the Turks, as well as others. All of them, in accordance with their customary practices, processed forth while holding their books, reciting verses from the Psalms of David, the Torah and the Gospels, and lamenting. The Muslims were unable to push them back with whips, sticks, and swords. That crowd would not be kept away and great chaos arose. News of this reached the Sultan of Islam, the chancellor and the chamberlain. The prominent monks and priests were summoned and asked: "What does this event have to do with you? This king of religion is our chief, imam and guide." They answered: "We came to understand the truth (ḥaqīqat) of Moses, the truth of Jesus and that of all the prophets from his clear words, and we beheld in him the behavior of the perfect prophets we read about in our scriptures. If you Muslims call the honorable Mawlana the Muhammad of your own age, we recognize him to be the Moses of the era and the Jesus of the age. As much as you love him and are devoted to him, we are his servants and disciples a thousand times more so.

Seventy-two communities heard their secret from us  
Like a flute that fits two hundred creeds with one scale.

In the same way, the essence of the honorable Mawlana is a sun of higher realities (ḥaqā'iq) which has shone on the people of this world and bestowed favor; the whole world adores the sun and everyone's house is illuminated by it."

Another rūmī priest said: “The similitude for Mawlana is bread—and one cannot do without bread. Have you ever seen a hungry person who shuns bread? But what do you know about who he was!”

All the nobles fell silent and said nothing. Meanwhile, from a different direction the euphonious Quran-memorizers recited marvelous verses with diligence, and the sweet-voiced Quran-readers raised their sighs to the clouds in the sky along with chants arousing lamentation and mingled with grief. And the beautiful-voiced muezzins—instead of calling out the arrival of the time for the prayer of Resurrection—announced this other event. And twenty groups of splendid singers chanted dirges for the honorable Mawlana that he had composed himself.

A significant point in the account of Rumi’s death is the way in which Christians and Jews are referred to in relation to Muslims. Aflaki’s narrative groups them in “all the communities” together with “the Arabs and the Turks” as well as others, including Greeks. In his use of the term *milla*—which can mean a national or communal group—Arabs and Turks are presented as distinct from “the Muslims” and the crowd was so great that “the Muslims” were unable to push back the members of these communities. Presumably the Muslims referred to in this passage do not include the Arabs and Turks, who are lumped together with Christians and Jews as the different communities (*milal*). Arguably then, confessional identity is less important to Aflaki than is communal identity, where communal includes the ethnolinguistic. Christians are different from Greeks in this context, perhaps indicating that Greeks are identifiable due to their numbers, whereas the category of “Christian” includes Armenians, Georgians, Syriac speakers, and so on. The reference to “others” at the end of the sentence might be a rhetorical device, but it might also refer to Kurds or members of other linguistic groups that were predominantly Muslim. “Muslim,” then, refers to a subgroup of the Muslim community, and is probably synonymous with “Persian-speakers” in this context, since Persian-speakers and émigrés comprised the educated, urban, religious, and social elite, as well as the circle of Rumi’s disciples, who would be judged to be the “true” Muslims in all cases in the *Manāqib al-`ārifīn*.

Ethnic differences among Muslims are certainly mentioned in the *Manāqib al-`ārifīn*. For example, Turks are depicted sometimes as coarse, uneducated people, as they often are in the Persian writings of this time. The distinction between Turks and Persians is made in the *Manāqib al-`ārifīn* using two paired anecdotes, where Persian-ness—defined linguistically—is clearly identified with Rumi and his way:

One day [Rumi] was walking in the bazaar of Konya. A Turk was clutching a fox skin and offering it for sale, shouting “*dilkū! dilkū* [“fox” in Turkish]!” The honorable Mawlana came whirling around and calling out “*dil kū, dil kū* (“where is the heart” in Persian)?” And he continued performing the *samā`* all the way back to the blessed madrasa.

This comes immediately after the following anecdote, which engages in a similar word play involving a Christian referred to using the aforementioned word *tarsā*, meaning both Christian and “fearful”:

One day when he had become excited performing the *samā`* ... out of nowhere a drunk came into the *samā`* gathering, raising a ruckus and completely out of his senses. He hit the honorable Mawlana, so the dear friends beat him. He [Rumi] said: “He is the one who has drunk wine and you are behaving like bad drunks!” They replied: “He is a Christian (*tarsā*)!” He said: “He is a *tarsā* (Christian) but why are you not *tarsā* (fearful)?” Lowering their heads, they sought forgiveness.

Aflaki imagines legitimate religious spaces in which Sufi masters can act and effect change as extending beyond the Islamic world and its Muslim population. He includes an account of Rumi’s son, Sultan

Walad, who relates how Rumi told him to take some companions and go to Damascus to look for Rumi's enigmatic companion and muse, Shams-i Tabrizi. Rumi said: "Carry an amount of silver and gold and pour it into [Shams's] shoes and turn his blessed shoes in the direction of Rūm [meaning Anatolia and Konya]. And convey my greetings to him and present him with my loving prostration (sajda-yi `āshiqāna).

They were to find Shams in a caravanserai on a mountain outside Damascus. "When you see Mawlana Shams he will be playing backgammon with a comely Frankish (farang) boy. When he wins in the end, he will take the money from the Frank. When he takes the money, the boy will slap him. Do not make the mistake of becoming angry, because that boy is one of the cosmic pillars (aqṭāb), but he does not recognize himself properly. He must—through the blessing of association with [Shams] and through his favor—demonstrate advancement toward the perfect state and become his disciple.

When Sultan Walad and his companion got to Damascus, events transpired exactly as Rumi had said they would. When they treated Shams with great respect, the Frankish boy got frightened, horrified at the rudeness he had displayed to someone who was clearly very important. Seeing the devoted interactions between Shams, Sultan Walad, and the other followers of Rumi, the Frankish boy converted to Islam and wanted to become a disciple. However, Shams said to him: "Return to the land of the Franks and honor the dear ones (‘azīzān) of those parts, and be the cosmic pillar (quṭb) of that community (jamā‘at). And do not forget us in your prayers.

Thus, according to Rumi (as recorded by Aflaki), not only can one of the axes of the metaphysical world reside in the land of the Franks, but he can be a Frank himself, his spiritual status predating his awareness and conversion to Islam.

### From Rumi to ‘Arif Chalabi

The invocation of Christianity and Christians is recurrent and nuanced in the *Manāqib al-‘ārifīn*, extending beyond Rumi's time into that of his successors. For example, Aflaki's own master, Ulu ‘Arif Chalabi, was notorious for his love of wine. Aflaki reports how once Ulu ‘Arif Chalabi was at a feast with a group of his disciples: "That day around twenty of the fortunate companions persisted in imbibing and drinking wine, and they indulged in a festivity in the manner of Jesus." The partaking in a feast in the company of disciples very clearly evokes the Last Supper in Aflaki's account. As the night progressed, the person in charge of providing the wine, Ulu ‘Arif's grandson Ilyas Pasha, began to worry that they were running out of the beverage, and kept complaining about it to Ulu ‘Arif. Eventually Ulu ‘Arif fell asleep; when Ilyas Pasha came to him because they were down to the last jug, Ulu ‘Arif awoke and scolded his grandson, using a word play on Ulu ‘Arif's own name as meaning "a knower": "How often are you going to say that? Be silent! ... If a knower of God (‘ārif) works from a single jug until dawn, it would not be a miracle!" ‘Arif then took the flask into his own hands before giving it back to Ilyas Pasha, who poured wine from it all night long, yet when the party was over the jug was still full.

Ulu ‘Arif Chalabi does not invoke Jesus and his disciples again when talking about the ever-flowing flask of wine, but the implicit message is clear: having set the stage early in the account that their feast was "in the manner of Jesus," satisfying a group of disciples with one flask of wine is reminiscent of Jesus feeding a multitude with a few loaves of bread.

Another account describes Ulu ‘Arif Chalabi carousing with Christian monks at the afore mentioned Monastery of Plato during the week preceding the Hajj, a time normally associated with pious behavior.

This incident serves as the occasion for the conversion of a Muslim aristocrat who comes to chastise him.<sup>30</sup> Yet another account, reminiscent of the drinking party described above, relates how `Arif made cucumbers appear miraculously in a garden that had only just been planted, and with them fed a large group of people:

[`Arif Chalabi] told them to bestow the cucumbers on all the companions and the inhabitants of the fortress, and that day all the young men and commanders became servants and disciples. It happened that Najm al-Din Dizdar remained preoccupied by this thought: "How did these cucumbers grow before their season, and what is this power and control over affairs which God Most High has bestowed on Chalabi `Arif?" The Chalabi immediately said: "Amir Najm al-Din, have you not read the story of Mary where it says: 'Shake for yourself the trunk of the palm-tree' (Q 19:25)? If the God who was able to bring succulent ripe dates into existence from a dry tree for Mary untouched by a male, if He should also make appear through the Divine Breath of Jesus (ʿĪsā nafasī) a few cucumbers for someone, that would not be strange and miraculous."

Najm al-Din immediately lowered his head and sought forgiveness. After the honorable Chalabi had departed, they saw that the garden had still not flowered; it was after one month that the fruits of the garden appeared.

Jesus occupies an important place in Islamic thought and popular piety, such that invocations of him do not constitute Christian references in and of themselves. But, given the fact that Rumi and his followers lived in an environment with a substantial Christian population and that many of the anecdotes related by Aflaki explicitly involve Christians, the invocations of Jesus are significant and do not parallel references to other important Islamic prophetic figures such as Abraham or Noah. In fact, Aflaki's accounts need Christian actors for their messages, as is apparent from the anecdotes featuring Rumi's disciple Theryanus as the protagonist. In one, a local religious scholar comes to Theryanus and complains that he has read a donkey-load (kharwār) of books but has not found any justification for the practice of samā' in any of them. Theryanus replies that the scholar reads like a donkey (kharwār), whereas the Sufi reads in the manner of Jesus and attains the inner meaning of texts.

This anecdote does more than providing evidence of Theryanus's famed erudition: the fact that it is a Christian convert who is speaking adds indexical value to the mention of Jesus. Put differently, Christian converts are useful in order to say and do things for which Christian credentials prove helpful. This can be illustrated with three accounts from the *Manāqib al-`ārifīn*, all featuring Theryanus. The first is of his conversion story, two anecdotes concerning which have been discussed earlier. At the end of it, Rumi asks Theryanus: "What do these Christian priests and men of learning, may Allah guide them, say about the real nature of Jesus, peace be upon him?" Theryanus replies: "They call him divine (khudā)." Rumi then says: "From now on say to them: 'Our Muhammad is more divine (Muhammad-i mā khudā tar)! Our Muhammad is more divine! Our Muhammad is more divine!'"

The other two anecdotes are in a similar vein but much more developed, since Theryanus affirms central Mevlevi doctrines in them. In one, a group of Muslim jurists accuses Theryanus in front of the chief qadī (malik al-quḍāt) of declaring that Rumi is God. Theryanus is arrested and brought before the chief qadī, who says: "Is it you who says that Mawlana is God?" Theryanus replies:

"God forbid! By no means! Rather I say Mawlana is a god-fashioner (khudā-sāz). Don't you see how he has made me? I was an infidel, far removed and obstinate. He bestowed mystical knowledge (ʿirfān) on me; he made me a religious scholar; he gave me reason and made me into a knower of God. He transported me from the rote behavior of invoking God (taqlīd-i khudā

khwānī) to the reality of knowing God (taḥqīq-i khudā dānī). ‘Whoever knows himself knows his Lord’ became the coin of my life. Until godliness is not in someone’s heart, it remains impossible to know God, and this is definitive proof.

The third anecdote is similar to the preceding one: “It happened that a group of masters of Sufism (arbā b-i taṣawwuf ) caught [Therianus] in their midst and reproached him, saying: ‘Why do you call Mawlana God?’ He replied: ‘Because I have not found anything above God or higher than that name which I might say. If there were something else, I would have said that.’” Then he uttered the following verse:

Out of love I feel ashamed to call him a mortal  
But I fear God if I were to say: “This is God.”

Through these accounts, Aflaki is attempting to teach that the sincere disciple on the Sufi path is allowed to say anything regarding his master, to whom he should be perfectly devoted. The points made in these anecdotes concerning Rumi’s divine nature or how a disciple should venerate his or her teacher are not unique to Therianus. However, value is added to the testimony by having the words spoken by someone who, through his Christian past, has greater expertise than the average Muslim in doctrines concerning divinity in human beings. Therianus personifies the erudite Christian convert in the Manāqib al-`ārifin precisely because Aflaki needs Therianus to make these points.

## The Imaginal Master

The ideal Sufi master—as exemplified by Rumi—has several important characteristics that help attract disciples in the immediate term. In the preceding pages I have provided examples of how such qualities are projected. At the same time, the master’s character—as reflected in hagiographical descriptions—serves in a number of different ways as an exemplary life for posterity. The ability of the master to project himself in the imaginal realm in a manner that is perceptible to the disciple (or potential new followers) is an important part of his authority, as is his general ability to manipulate conventional rules of perception. In Rumi’s case, anecdotes that record such prowess serve the additional goal of explicitly placing Rumi above other respected Sufi masters and in going even further to demonstrate how Rumi is of equal rank to earlier prophets.

The Manāqib al-`ārifin emphasizes Rumi’s similarity to prophets on several occasions and clearly suggests that Rumi likened his disciples to the companions and followers (tābi`ūn) of the prophet Muhammad. For example, on one occasion Rumi is reported to have said to his disciples: “Allah! Allah! For as long as one is able to sit in discipleship (ṣuḥbat) and service (khidmat) to a master, everything other than this service and occupation is worthless. And if one cannot do this discipleship [to a Sufi shaykh], then you must sit in discipleship with the companions. And if you can’t do that, then you must occupy yourself with their words and teachings. And if that is impossible, then you should busy yourself with religious duties and acts of worship (ṭā`at-i ḥaqq).

Rumi’s authority is ratified by Muhammad in dreams and visions, as demonstrated in the following episode from the Manāqib al-`ārifin:

Mawlana Shams al-Din Mardini said, “One night, I saw the honorable Messenger, upon him be peace, in my dreams. He was sitting. When I went before him and greeted him, he turned his blessed face away from me. I went around to that side and he did the same. I cried out in tears: ‘O Messenger of God! For so many years I have endured hardship in the hopes of your affection and care. I have studied, working hard to verify hadith traditions and to answer religious questions, all for your sake. What is it that causes you to deprive this wretch?’ The Prophet said,

'All of that is true, but you look toward my brethren (ikhwān) with disdain. This act does not please me; this behavior and this attitude are both sins and manifest bad deeds.

O you who consider the friends of God separate from Him,  
If you have good thoughts, then why not for His friends?  
Especially toward Mawlana, who is a child of my spirit!"

He said: "When I awoke, I sought refuge in God and repented of that behavior. As yet I had not been honored by becoming a disciple of Mawlana. In the end, in obedience, I became one of [Rumi's] sincere followers.

The ability to appear to others in visions and to travel in the imaginal realm is one of the powers that links the Sufi master to Quranic prophets, both through evoking them and through mimicking an important quality of prophethood. According to one anecdote in the *Manāqib al-ʿārifin*, a merchant came to Rumi in order to understand why his business was going badly. Rumi told him that it was because he had treated a very important dervish saint poorly in the western most land of the Franks while he was conducting business there. Rumi went on to say that the only way for the merchant to fix his business problems was to go back and ask that dervish's forgiveness. He also commanded the man to convey Rumi's greetings to the dervish.

Sensing the merchant's amazement at his insight, Rumi said: "Do you want to see him right now? Look!" He then placed his hand on the wall, causing a door to open and allowing the merchant to see the dervish sleeping on a street corner somewhere in the land of the Franks. The merchant tore at his shirt and lost control of his senses. When he came to, he immediately set out for Europe to rectify his past error. Upon reaching his destination, he found the man sleeping exactly as Rumi had shown him. The merchant then begged the Frankish dervish's forgiveness, at which the latter said: "What can I do? Mawlana does not allow me to show you the power of God ..." He then spoke kindly to the merchant, embraced him and said: "Now look! You will see my honorable master and lord!" The merchant looked and he saw Rumi lost in *samāʿ*, dancing while reciting the following lines of poetry:

His kingdom contains the coarse and the fine of all kinds.  
If you wish, be ruby or carnelian, if you wish, be clay or stone  
If you're a believer He seeks you, if you're a disbeliever he cleanses you  
Go this way and be a Muslim (*ṣiddīq*), go that way and be a Frank.

Upon returning to Konya, the merchant brought Rumi the greetings of the Franks and became a faithful disciple.

Other accounts place Rumi in relation to living and dead Sufi masters for the dual purpose of defining the parameters of Sufi authority and of demonstrating Rumi's superiority to others. According to one of them, once during a *samāʿ* in his madrasa, Rumi became moved to great ecstasy; he kept approaching the area of the singers and musicians, where he would offer praise and ask forgiveness before falling back into ecstasy. He kept doing this to the point that his disciples became bewildered, wondering whom he was addressing. When the *samāʿ* ended, one of the senior disciples politely asked Rumi about what had just transpired. Rumi replied, saying that "the secret of the spirit (*sirri rūḥāniyyat*)" of Hakim Sana'i (d. before 1141) had appeared in bodily form (*mutamaththal shuda*). He had stood among the musicians playing the frame drum while reciting beautiful verses. Rumi had been going over to him to offer praise and make excuses so that Sana'i would be pleased with the gathering.

The dead Sana'i's ability to imaginalize himself is similar to Rumi's and underscores how true Sufi masters necessarily possess this quality, with the corollary message that those who do not appear imaginally in



such a way are lesser Sufi masters. In works such as the *Manāqib al-`ārifin*, it is often the act of making oneself appear to others that demonstrates this spiritual superiority. In one anecdote Rumi himself tells how it is the power of travelling in another dimension that allows Sufi masters to make themselves apparent in the physical world in ways that confound physical rules:

[In] the city of Konya there was a gentleman (khwāja) named Amira who was reputable and a believer, and he was one of the devotees and lovers [of Rumi]. It happened that he vowed to visit the revered Ka`ba. Having sought Mawlana's permission and favor, he set out. He recounted: "In every way station, place and town that I reached, I would see a formed image (muṣawwar) of the honorable Mawlana and be astonished. When I arrived in Damascus, I saw he was walking on the roof of the congregational mosque and gesturing toward me. Due to the overpowering nature of the situation I lost consciousness and lay sleeping until close to the hour of the next prayer. When I recovered my senses, I didn't see anyone. Thus, bewildered and in a distressed state, I set out for the revered Ka`ba. Afterward, when I had been honored with circumambulating the Ka`ba, I saw the honorable Mawlana performing the circumambulation. And on top of Mount Arafat I saw him in intimate prayer with God (munājāt).

When I was blessed to return to Konya, still covered in dust, I went directly to be honored by kissing Mawlana's hand. I saw a group of companions seated there, and Mawlana said: 'Yes, Haji Amira! Know that the men of God are always travelling about like fish in the ocean of divine power. Wherever they want, they stick their heads out and show their faces. And wherever their supporters seek them, they find them.' I lowered my head and kissed his blessed feet.

Elsewhere, Rumi uses his powers not to transport himself but to imaginalize (or perhaps existentially) an object, in this case the Ka`ba. According to Aflaki, a saintly woman named Fakhr al-Nisa, who was widely known for her miracles and piety, used to visit Rumi often. After a number of religious people urged her to fulfill her obligation to go on Hajj, she decided to come and seek his advice in the matter. As soon as she entered the room, he said: "This is a very good intention and a blessed journey! I hope that we can undertake it together. Fakhr al-Nisa lowered her head silently, while Rumi's disciples were left wondering what was transpiring between Rumi and the saintly woman.

That night she and Rumi's disciples stayed at his house. After midnight, Rumi went to the roof of the madrasa and busied himself with his nighttime prayers. When he had finished, he began crying out loudly and signaled to Fakhr al-Nisa that she should climb up to the roof. When she had joined him, Rumi said: "Look up! Your objective has presented itself to you!" She looked up and saw the Ka`ba spinning and circling around Rumi. She then let out a cry and lost consciousness; and when she came to, she had lost her desire to go on the Hajj. Rumi then recited a ghazal that began with the following lines:

The Ka`ba circles at the entrance to the alley of an idol!  
What idol is this, O God? What affliction and disaster?  
Before her, the full moon is a broken disc—  
Before her sweetness, sugar cane is an annoying fly.

## Conclusion

The anecdotes from Aflaki's *Manāqib al-`ārifin* discussed above stress the importance of imagining and the imagination in conveying intended meanings and symbols in Sufi writings at a number of levels. In the most basic sense, hagiography (and perhaps all biography) is an exercise in imagining, since it purports to represent a life or a collection of lives to an audience that is not the subject of the narration. The

anecdotes in Aflaki's work cumulatively create an image of the lives of Rumi and the other principle characters of thirteenth- and early fourteenth-century Konya in the minds of the audience.

This broad purpose of imagining a life or lives has some specific goals, prominent among which is the attempt to create a picture of an ideal way of being Muslim, and perhaps even human. It is to this end that conversion from other forms of Islam, as well as from other religions, plays such a prominent part in the narratives. More than anything else, what a Sufi master does is save people by guiding them to a noetic salvation, an enterprise that depends entirely on the Sufi master already possessing the requisite knowledge and understanding he or she wishes to impart to the disciple. Anecdotal demonstrations of the master's control over physical, visual, and auditory representation provide cogent proof of such knowledge. Not only can the master only be seen when and where he chooses—he can also see what others cannot. <>

## **REIMAGINING SPIRIT: WIND, BREATH, AND VIBRATION** by Grace Ji-Sun Kim [Cascade Books, 9781532689253]

The Spirit presents itself to many as an enigma. Its existence is mysterious and complex, generating misunderstandings and unawareness of its true purpose. The Spirit's ambiguous nature opens the opportunity for study to unearth the exciting truths that it holds.

The Spirit is present in our world in various forms. This book aims to examine the Spirit as experienced in light, wind, breath, and vibration to help us uncover some of its aspects that invite us to work for climate justice, racial justice, and gender justice. The Holy Spirit has always been a mover and shaker of ideas and action. The Spirit's presence moves, stirs, and changes us to become aware of the social ills in our world.

The different ways in which we reimagine the Holy Spirit can challenge some traditional assumptions in Christianity and provide a liberative vision that allows us to work for social justice. The work of the Holy Spirit stirs us to work toward new kinships with God that are sustainable, just, and whole.

- Table of Contents
- Acknowledgments
- Introduction
- Chapter 1: Global World, Spirit, and Han
- Chapter 2: Spirit as Light
- Chapter 3: Spirit as Wind and Breath
- Chapter 4: Spirit as Vibration
- Chapter 5: Spirit and Social Action
- Conclusion
- Bibliography

Excerpt: I am captivated by mystery. I have always confronted the unsolved problem, the unrevealed truth, and that thrilling uncertainty with a kind of confidence that was at times unprecedented or credulous. Yet the subject that has loomed over my unwavering nerve is also that of the greatest significance; it is the most enigmatic piece of the puzzle within my own spirituality: the Holy Spirit.

Like many others, I experience the Holy Spirit as a mystery. While it has been referenced routinely in historical texts and modern discourse, this entity is seldom understood. I have come a long way in my relationship to an understanding of the Holy Spirit, moving from a place of blind acknowledgment to a place of informed passion.

In my religious practice, I return time and time again to a position of investigation when studying the Spirit. In doing so, I try to make sense of the problems we face in the present day while also elucidating troubles in the past. It is a daunting task. However, this experience evokes challenging, powerful, and deeply personal insights that induce rare chances to recall lost memories and embrace new risks. Here, I am able to confront my whole past while continuing to embrace the future.

This book offers a distinct approach to the Holy Spirit. As you explore new territories, reach new communities, and travel the vastness of our Earth, you will recognize that the Spirit's presence transcends time, place, culture, and religion. It is completely free; it is important to be open to this notion as we explore together and create a pneumatology that speaks inclusively, on a local, global, and universal level.

### The “Holy” in Spirit

The Spirit is experienced and understood by people all over the globe, from various religions and cultures. However, in Christianity, we decided to add the word holy in front of the word Spirit, which then paved the road to make the Spirit exclusive to Christianity. The addition of holy before the word Spirit makes it clear that the Spirit is set apart from other things in the seen world. The Holy Spirit is no ordinary thing.

Within Christianity, God's Spirit is called *Pneuma Hagion*—Holy Spirit. The power of God is understood to be the Spirit of God moving in the world around us to change us and help us live in the pursuit of greater justice.

As we move into the New Testament, we will see that it is made explicit that the Spirit is now associated with Jesus, who lived and worked under the power of the Holy Spirit (Luke 4:1). Not only was his birth initiated by the Holy Spirit (Matt 1:18), but the Holy Spirit was seen to descend upon Jesus at his baptism (Mark 1:10).<sup>3</sup> After Jesus ascended to heaven, he sent the Spirit to the people. The Spirit of God that was active in Jesus' life is the same Spirit that is active in ours.

### Spirit Walks with You

There was a mystery about the Spirit during the time of Jesus, and that mystery still remains. No one fully comprehends the Spirit. We may never fully comprehend the Spirit or the Spirit's action in our lives. But this may not be a bad thing, because if we could fully comprehend it and come to know everything about it, then it would not be God.

As in the past, the modern church continues to believe that the Spirit belongs to them. They teach that the Spirit, along with its gifts and its grace, can only be accessed in the church. Today, some of us are recognizing that the walls of the church cannot bind the Spirit and that this ideology is actually detrimental to those it involves and targets. The Spirit, God's eschatological presence and power, guides the church, but it is the *ruach* who is ever-present in creating and in redeeming, present in the words of Jesus and those who follow him.

The understanding of the Spirit was not always clear to the people around Jesus and those following him. Even the disciples were not in full knowledge of what the Spirit meant. Toward the end of his ministry, Jesus promised his disciples that the Holy Spirit would be their constant companion (John 14:26) after he inevitably had to leave them. They were told that the Spirit would comfort them, help them, and guide them (Luke 12:12). After the crucifixion and the resurrection, Jesus the Christ gave the Spirit to the disciples by breathing on them (John 20:22).

The early Christian communities consistently spoke of the Spirit as the motherly, regenerative breath and power of God within creation. They believed that the Hebrew feminine name of the Spirit, ruach, was a linguistic clue to certain feminine-specific characteristics of God as Spirit. As these early Christians rightly understood, God transcends gender. Their point was not that God was a female deity but that it is appropriate to refer to God's mystery, love, and power in both masculine and feminine terms.

The Spirit is God's presence as well as the eschatological presence. It guides the eschatological community of those born again through faith in Christ. The Spirit speaks to the church in times of crisis (Rev 2–3), enabling them to preach the word of God (Luke 12:12). It also builds up the church by empowering members to maintain their unity (Acts 4) and serve the common good with their gifts of ministry (1 Cor 12).

The Spirit liberates, transforms, reconciles, empowers, and assures. The Spirit is powerful and uses its capacity to empower us to do God's work. The church is reminded that to be "in Christ" is the same as being "in the Spirit" (1 Cor 12:3).

### Hybrid Pneumatology

Contextual theology sees religious pluralism as an exception rather than the norm. Liberation is not imposing a new idea; it is a response to voices within and outside of the biblical tradition.<sup>7</sup> A hybrid pneumatology is not bound within the limits of Christianity when it searches for contextual methods of understanding the Spirit. Hybrid pneumatology is Christianity remaining bound to the Spirit itself rather than to the Spirit of a philosophical ideology. It can open other religious sources to illuminate our understanding of the Spirit. As we talk about God and Spirit, it is crucial to contemporary theological discourse that we are not just open to other religious views and understandings but also respect these beliefs within the landscape of our own.

Many people live in the in-between space of different groups: different generations, different social networks, and different cultures. This is of course not a set space but rather an unbounded, porous setting that allows its residents to move freely. In respect to religious differences, we must understand that despite different belief systems, there can never be a wholly monolithic framework. These things exist dynamically in reaction and relation to the conditions they are set in. It is in this in-between space that we find divine existence. The reign of God is built in the areas between us; therefore, that space becomes sacred ground. The Divine exists in a space beyond our imagination. We can begin to theologize and encounter the Divine in this space, which is open, vibrant, and infinite.

This re-envisioned pneumatology works toward eliminating destructive habits, such as racism and sexism, both of which are heavily ingrained within all dominant modern societies. In turn, the understanding of Chi vibration, breath, light, and Spirit will empower all people to live holistic lives while working towards making this world a better place for all those who inhabit it.

### Book Outline

The Spirit is not part of the observable world, and because we cannot see it or touch it, we will never fully uncover its mysteries. However, we can uncover the ways that the Spirit is present in our world by examining our experiences with light, wind, and vibration. This book will examine these ways of experiencing the Spirit in the world, and in connecting the Spirit with creation, it will ultimately emphasize the great importance of creation care.

Environmental justice has not been a priority in many of our lives. This book invites us to participate in taking care of all of God's creation.

The same Spirit who was present at creation reminds us of God's continued presence in creation today. Though we are collectively ignoring the cries of the Earth, the Spirit is begging us to take care of the Earth, for in doing so, we are taking care of each other and God. Climate change is the monumental issue of our time, and in order to work towards improving the state of our Earth, we need to take a closer look at our theology and pneumatology, because how we view God has a direct impact on how we take care of the planet.

This book will follow three movements: light, wind, and vibration. These three movements will work toward deepening the understanding of God as Spirit, which I hope will inspire all of us to become involved in creation care and sustainable practices. The book will begin with contextual pneumatology and will subsequently explore Spirit as light, wind, and vibration. The chapters will be a biblical/theological study of the work of the Spirit—the overall “work of the Spirit”—illustrated from Scripture, history, culture, and doctrine. These chapters will each be tied to social justice issues, such as climate change, racism, and sexism. Adopting the living expression of the Spirit's actions as light, wind, and vibration will inspire us to work for change and move towards greater equity and good.

This book challenges an assumption some Christians make that the Holy Spirit is only available to baptized Christians, promoting the view that the Spirit exists in all cultures and faiths. God's affirmation, “I WILL BE WHO I WILL BE,” (Exod 3:14) illustrates that the Spirit cannot be restricted by one religious group and is present in all creation and among all people, including “the other.”

We live in a global world, and therefore, it is crucial that we talk about the Spirit in ways that are and can be experienced globally. We live in a world where divergent cultures and religions feud over legitimacy; the need to coexist compassionately becomes essential as we seek environmental and social aid.

This book is biblically and theologically grounded, tackling one of the most important topics of our day. The environmental path that society has chosen is a clear path to destruction. Therefore, it is necessary that we take actions that are informed by faith and beliefs. It is crucial that corrective measures are initiated immediately. We have been taught that the Spirit is gentle, that it is the comforter that Jesus sends to us, but it is important to recognize that for all the Spirit's kindness, its power is unimaginable. The power of the Spirit will transform our lives, our ways of thinking, and our experiences of God. These transformative experiences will offer us the tools we need to live sustainably in nature as God's creation and God's love.

This book will provoke readers into higher consciousness and push them to think of experiencing and referring to the Holy Spirit in deeper and more innovative ways. It will awaken readers to the Spirit's presence in their lives, helping all to recognize the power it holds—reinvigorating and surprising us with newfound knowledge, opportunities, power, and passion.

## Spirit's World

The world is filled with the Spirit. Everywhere you look, the presence of the Spirit is felt. As we travel around the world, we recognize and witness the work of the Spirit in our churches, our communities, and our families. The Spirit both lives in the world and works in our lives. The presence of the Spirit is undeniable. The Spirit is light, wind, and vibration; it is all around us and in us.

As we see the work of the Spirit around the globe, one question in particular arises. Does the Spirit belong solely to Christianity? If the Spirit is light, wind, and vibration, does it exist outside the Christian

church, and can it be present in the life of other faith traditions? It is with this question that we seek to gain a better understanding of the Holy Spirit and the Spirit within us. In turn, this informs our global understanding that the Holy Spirit is the Christian vision of a universal human perception. The Spirit is God, and no one community can hold or possess it. It is free and able to move as it wishes in the world. The gift of life and the struggle for the equality of life are sustained by the Spirit's power, and this cannot be simply contained within the Christian church or tradition.

The Spirit proceeds from the whole world and manifests itself in nature.<sup>1</sup> While Christians tend to understand the Spirit in relation to the Trinity, it is helpful to consider the ways in which other faiths see it in relation to the body. We need to be aware of this presence and make room for its participation, allowing it to permeate our lives and to move and work within us. Whenever we welcome and embrace the Spirit within our lives, we draw nearer to God. God is in all things because all things are in God. God is ubiquitous: God is wherever creation is. God is all around us. The Spirit empowers us and possesses us to act, taking care of each other and of creation. It begs us to deepen our knowledge of God and challenges us to search the world for more nuanced ways of speaking and interacting with the divine.

It is important that we work to free the Spirit so that we do not restrain the movement and work of the Spirit through our limited understanding. To do so, we must recognize the freedom of the Spirit. One cannot say that the Spirit only belongs to Christians—the Spirit moves around the whole globe and is present in all places. One might find that people of different faiths also experience and articulate the Spirit in their lives. The Spirit is freely moving and cannot be contained, and Christianity surely cannot commandeer it based on how they have experienced God. In Judeo-Christian scripture, God says “I AM WHO I AM” (Exod 3:14), which demonstrates that the movement of God is not constrained by what human beings dictate.

Under European colonization, Christianity has tried to monopolize the Divine Spirit for far too long. Christianity has instructed and claimed that only Christianity possesses the Spirit, arguing that all other “spirits” or experiences of the “spirit” are false. As Christianity colonized different parts of the world, it spread its theologies of God and the Spirit, overcoming Islam, Hindu religions, and Buddhism. Christianity sought to present itself as the superior religion that understood and maintained control of the Divine Spirit. Supposedly only Christianity could grasp divine understanding and comprehension of the Spirit. According to that worldview, one would have to follow Christianity to experience the Divine Spirit and truly understand it. This history of monopolization of the Spirit must be reexamined, reconsidered, and challenged.

When Christianity plays an imperial role, it has the tendency to view itself as a belief system superior to oral cultures. As a result, the primordial stranger becomes the Other—a stranger unlike us and less worthy than we are. However, beautiful things are bound to happen when we come to recognize the stranger among us. We understand that this Spirit cannot be constrained and contained within Christianity. The Spirit moves freely as a manifestation of a God who says “I AM WHO I AM” (Exod 3:14). We cannot safeguard the Spirit within Christianity and present it to the world as something exclusively for Christians to encounter.

When the American astronaut Scott Kelly posted pictures on his Twitter account of the Earth, it became clear to me the scale of humanity within the grandiosity of the Earth. Clearly, Christians are not the center of the universe. Christians cannot hold onto something that “hovers over the surface of the water” (Gen 1:2) and proclaims “I WILL BE WHAT I WILL BE” (Exod 3:14). Given that the Spirit is

boundless, it is naïve for Christians to claim that only our Spirit is holy. In so many ways, the Spirit opens rather than closes the door for us to be in conversation with other world religions. Thus, the presence of the Spirit creates an “open space,” wherein we encounter the Other in his or her full dignity and uniqueness.

The Christian doctrine of the Spirit has the potential to open space for interfaith dialogue. As the Spirit moves in our lives and gives us breath, life, and sustenance, we become open to various movements of the Spirit in all places, traditions, cultures, and religions. This is the movement of the Spirit that no single person, doctrine, or church can control.

Living in a dynamic time, when the world is technologically advancing and quickly diversifying, is an exciting new prospect; a new world where varied peoples come together as neighbors and form new cultures. However, as we enter such a world of interdependence, we must be able to communicate cross-culturally in order to create harmony. Therefore, as cultures collide with one another, it is important to find common ground.

### Life Isn't Fair

Generally, good people will say that they hope for a world where all lives are valued fairly and where those who do bad are punished accordingly. We want to see the innocent happy and liberated and the corrupt penalized and incarcerated. But we know that this idealistic fantasy is far from reality.

As I raise my three children, I often notice that all three do not receive the same treatment. I know I am the harshest towards my oldest son when he does something wrong. I believe that if he succeeds or does well, then there will be a trickle-down effect, and the other two siblings will also succeed. Furthermore, by the time the youngest gets in trouble for the same thing, I am too exhausted to discipline him. So, one might say that he gets away with everything. Even the older two kids notice it, and they frequently remark, “Mom, you don't punish him enough.”

But equal uniform treatment is just not possible when dealing with people, particularly teenagers. Inevitably, I fall into the trap of behaving differently towards each child, treating them as I believe they need to be treated in the moment, with attention to their individual needs. It has both positive and negative impacts, but as parents, we must use our best judgment and keep our children as the ultimate priority.

As we go through life, it becomes clear that the nicest people do not always win. Sometimes the worthy get the raw end of the deal, and their less deserving counterparts reap benefits.

In certain ways, when we think about grace, it is the same thing. Grace is not about getting what we deserve or about getting just punishment. Instead, grace is an opportunity for us to escape the consequential sufferings for our actions. And for many people, this is upsetting.

We want people to get what they deserve. But God is not like that. The beauty of God is revealed to us in God's Spirit, which manifests as grace toward all people.

### God's Spirit and Grace

The Holy Spirit is the gift to the world. It is grace to us. God's grace is transformative as it changes and makes us anew. The Spirit is grace that changes us and changes the world. We are to build the kingdom of God through the power of the Holy Spirit as grace.



For Augustine, the Holy Spirit is the uncreated grace (*gratia increata*). Thus, grace and justification are understood as the effects of the Holy Spirit. Grace is participation in the Divine or, in other words, grace is divine nature. It is given to us and resides in us. Grace is about being set free. The Spirit frees us from the burden of trying to prove ourselves worthy, good, and desirable. The Spirit sets us free to be carefree and to be ourselves. It frees us to move as the wind. This will allow the Spirit to move within us and fill us so that the Spirit can move us.

We emphasize that grace is a gift from God. It is something that we do not deserve but receive. We did not deserve the Holy Spirit to come dwell in us, but we are the recipients of God's grace and mercy. We are the end road of God's mercy. We are to be open to the grace, love, and goodness of the Holy Spirit.

We have often viewed the Holy Spirit as a tool to help us. But it is not purposed to be a tool. It is a gift, given to us so that we may live more fully and abundantly. The Holy Spirit as grace compels us to action in the world.

The church has somehow forgotten this meaning of the Holy Spirit as a gift to us. We have lost the powerful meaning and place of grace in our lives. Grace embraces us and carries us through the good times and the most difficult times. Grace is abundant for us, and it will free us.

God's grace is transformative. It holds no grudges. It forgives. It heals. It releases one's hand. It builds bridges. It helps us understand that God is within us. God never leaves us. We need to move forward in understanding that it is the grace within that liberates us and moves us. God's grace comes through the Spirit, which is freely given to us and moves us to work toward justice. God's grace is strong, motivating us to work to make this world a better place. We need to open ourselves to receive God's grace, which will assure us of God's love and mercy for us.

Understanding and embracing the Holy Spirit is important to Christian living today. The Spirit is reflected in our relationships with people, with the planet, and with God. These areas are vitally important, as they are the areas of growth we urgently need to develop. We seek the Spirit to empower us to build a peaceful reign of God's justice on Earth.

The world is torn by injustice, retribution, discrimination, terrorism, and pain. We cause harm to others. We are at a pivot in the life of humanity, a point where our continued wrong turns may cause irreversible damage to the Earth. We began as a small species in an immense world, but we have proliferated and dominated the Earth like it was ours, creating much harm to the Earth in just the last 200 years.

Harm is presented in the ways that Christians have historically and contemporarily demonized other religions. In the Western world, it is Islam that has been condemned. However, we know that protecting our orthodoxy is not important to a God who says, "I WILL BE WHO I WILL BE." Euro-centric Christianity is not as important as it once was, because Christianity is becoming less relevant to white people in Europe and North America. Yet its relevance is mobilized and moves towards the global South and Bantu, where Afro-Semitic dialects join Spanish, English, German, French, and Dutch dialects as important Christian languages. As Christianity moves southward, we need to recognize the power of spiritualities that have existed in these cultures for thousands of years. As we recognize the breadth and scope of the Holy Spirit experienced by people around the world, we recognize the opportunity to open the Spirit of our own Christian faith.

What Did YOU Do All Day?



Our lives are complicated. We have expectations from many people who also have many expectations of us. There are religious, cultural, familial, and career expectations laid upon us, which work curiously with our own expectations of ourselves.

These social and internal expectations are tested for many people that are leaving nine-to-five careers for freelance work, where they can have more freedom in choosing their schedules. These individuals, such as freelance writers and editors, can give others the impression that they don't have a job.

A few summers ago, my eldest son was enrolled in the Johns Hopkins Summer program for gifted and talented youth. I dropped him off at eight every morning and picked him up at nine every night for three weeks. One morning before I dropped him off, he suddenly asked me to get him a pair of white socks. I told him that I would if I had time to get them.

That day, I was too busy to go to the department store to pick up a pair, so when I picked him up at nine he asked me if I got them.

I said, "Sorry, no."

To my surprise, he then asked me, "What did you even do all day?"

In his mind, he innocently believed that his mother's daily life could not possibly occupy the time it took to adhere to his request. It was a quick response to an idea that as a mother, he had subtle control of his own life through mine.

Humans seek control in every way. In particular, we seek to control the people in our relationships. Sometimes this pursuit is successful. A son pushed by a hopeful parent to become a lawyer may likely become one, or a partner encouraged by a spouse to quit their job after having children may indeed quit a job. However, our desire to control God and the Spirit cannot be satisfied. The Spirit moves as it will, and we have no control. We cannot control the Spirit, but there are ways in which we can be aware of the guidance of the Spirit.

Realizing we have no control of the Spirit is alarming to many people. No control means being at the mercy and grace of God. But we need to be especially open to the movement of the Spirit. The Spirit plays the music of the spheres on its reed pipe, and we need to listen to it and obey its tunes.

## Power With

The Spirit is so powerful that it can invert the way we see things. Power is understood in many forms. Starhawk is a theorist of feminist Neopaganism who believes that power is another word for energy, the subtle current of forces that shape reality. She differentiates between "power over," "power within," and "power with." "Power over" is the mode of patriarchal societies. It expresses the logic of domination by which some—mostly males—dominate women, subjugate classes, disenfranchise races, and rape the nonhuman world. "Power over" operated in the colonized world, and it has long sustained subordination as colonized societies were rendered powerless. Remnants of that power linger strongly today.

"Power within" is a process by which dominated people relieve themselves of the control of others and their own internalization of the powerlessness projected onto them, laying hold of their innate power and goodness. "Power with" encourages the sharing of power, to affirm oneself while also mutually affirming one another. Here, each person flourishes by promoting the flourishing of others. This type of power is life-giving, sustaining, and encouraging.

The power of the Spirit is “power with.” It is a sharing of power as the Spirit vibrates and moves in us so that we become collaborators with the power of the Spirit. It leads to greater accomplishments of us, society, and the world. The Spirit brings forth life-changing power that becomes a transformative and energetic force in our lives. With the transformative power of the Spirit, we can achieve great things.

As Christians, we cannot just think about the Spirit. We need to be able to live with the Spirit, through the Spirit, and by the Spirit for our inner transformation to take place. Only then will the changes we seek in the world take place.

We must allow the Spirit to motivate us and stir us to seek global justice. We must be guided by the Spirit in all that we do. We work with the movement of the Spirit as wind, light, and breath to change us and empower us to be agents of change.

When the Spirit fills our lives, we follow the rhythm of the Spirit. We are guided by the Spirit to become new creatures and become agents of change. We become workers in the Spirit and for the Spirit.

### Powerful Scriptural Spirit

In the Hebrew Bible, the Spirit empowers the Servant of God to work for justice and peace and to create a community of liberated life (Isa 11). In the New Testament, at Pentecost, there is a powerful outpouring of the Spirit (Acts 2:1–3). The communities of followers of Jesus received the Spirit, which was understood to be the source of an extraordinary power. It is power beyond our worldly comprehension and beyond our worldly expectations. The Spirit empowered and directed the early church. The Spirit that created life, transformed the people, and moved the early church is not gone. Enter now that life of the Spirit.

Christ is portrayed as “a life-giving Spirit” (1 Cor 15:45). The believer has a responsibility to live her life in the power of the Spirit (Rom 8:4–6, 14).<sup>6</sup> This responsibility should not be taken lightly, as one should not ignore the depth of the Spirit’s power. Walking in the power of the Spirit is life-changing, as the Spirit becomes an agent through which transformations can occur.

John’s letters speak of anointing with the Spirit (1 John 2:20, 27). The Spirit is named the “other Paraclete” (John 14:16), which implies that Jesus is the first (1 John 2:1). The term *parakletos* (from *para*+*kalein*) means “one called alongside to help,” and thus is an advocate or witness (John 14:26).<sup>7</sup> The Spirit may be that Paraclete which becomes a source of inspiration and light as we feel its presence around us. The Spirit becomes a facet of faithful living as an advocate for a life of good stewardship.

The Spirit as light, chi, and peace gives us the energy and the power to do the work of God. We are to become the light of the world. The light does not hide under a bushel but shines brightly in the darkness. We are to shine brightly in this broken world to help repair the damage. We are to shout from the mountaintops and declare the goodness of God.

The chi is power and life-giving energy. Chi in our bodies will give us renewed life and energy to become agents of change. Chi requires us to move from the worship halls of raised hands that praise God to the broken world that needs repair. Chi will give us the peace to do the healing and repairing that is desperately needed in our world.

## Power of the Spirit to Rebuild the Earth

God is the defender of the poor and the oppressed (Jer 9:23). God did not withhold his wrath against those who harmed widows and orphans. Scripture suggests we do the same. It is a commandment from God that all are required to follow and obey. We are to live it out in our lives, and God's Spirit makes it possible.

Under the Spirit's guidance, we can imagine a society that will seek sustainability and equity. We can imagine a society where the community makes decisions to maintain the common good for their people and the Earth. We can recognize that all forms of capital must be considered in the notion of the good life and first is "nature's capital." The good life is dependent on nature's capital. We must resist the tendency to see nature as an inexhaustible commodity. We need to work towards justice as sustainability. We need goals for planetary living that fulfill what Jesus meant by the reign of God.

In many Asian cultures, as with the Israelites of the Old Testament, time is understood as cyclical. Time is happening simultaneously at more than one level. So the past can be present and the present intertwines with the past. There seems to be neither a beginning nor an end. In the West, time is considered to be linear. This makes it difficult to grasp biblical eschatology, where the present and the future—"the now and the not yet"—are seen as interconnected. The study of pneumatology, Spirit and its values, helps us understand how the Advent experience of waiting for God to come and the historical experience of remembering God who has come eventually integrate. It creates an open attitude towards life as a gift, renewing itself from the past and into the future. The Spirit is a movement: the Spirit, who goes between spaces, moves through the interstices of space and time. The Spirit challenges us to recognize that our past and future are connected by God and that both are important for us today.

As we engage in conversations about the Spirit, we recognize that the Holy Spirit transforms us to become the best that we can be by our love. Love is what challenges and moves us toward justice and wholeness. The power of the Spirit centers us and carries us into the web of life. We are part of creation and creation is part of us.

Love happens in different ways. Agape love will move us to move the world. Love changes our world. We need to allow the Spirit to enter our hearts with love and empower us to work for justice. We need to surrender to the Spirit so that we can be filled with the Spirit. The love of the Spirit will empower us to work for God: to generate justice, be merciful, and fill the world with God's love. The Spirit, the power of Eros, makes that possible. This erotic power motivates us and works through us. As we experience God's presence, we each contribute to the building of the reign of God here on Earth. It is a task that calls all of us.

We cannot change our ways alone; we require the power of the Holy Spirit to transform us and help us to move forward to build a sustainable reign of God in this world. We need to work together to save our planet and ourselves. Welcome the Spirit to center us in a vision to find the means we need to build the kin-dom of God.

Understanding and embracing the Holy Spirit is vital to Christian living today. The Spirit is reflected in our relationships with others, with the planet, and with God. These three areas are crucial. It is imperative that we work with the Holy Spirit to change ourselves and our relations.

## Surrendering to the Spirit

We desire to control everything. All the variables that we can control in our lives are usually handled with some kind of governance. The time we wake up in the morning; the route we take to work; the

food we eat for dinner; or our schedules for the upcoming weeks. We are a society that is buttressed on these little choices, but when we lose a grip on the reins of control, we may go a little crazy. As a mother of three children, I would like to think that I have some kind of control over them. I urge my children to work hard to get good grades at school, meet the right type of friends, and behave in a particular way that I believe is correct. I want them to achieve their own milestones while becoming the best versions of themselves. However, this hoped-for outcome is not limited to their own will, as I am constantly there providing them some kind of influence and some sort of authority.

We cannot behave in such a way with the Spirit. We need to be able to surrender to the Spirit, allowing it to be within us so that we can practice stewardship in this world. We can do this through sustainable living and working towards loving those who are different from us. If the Spirit resides in us, we will recognize the importance of extending grace to the planet. We will recognize that our selfish ways are harmful to the Earth.

### My Mother's Last Fight

While we try to maintain control in our lives, we cannot but help to encounter the bountiful surprises that life throws at us. Of course, some of them are good, while others are not so good at all. We will find ourselves reaching moments where we are incredibly joyful, only to get thrown a bombshell that shatters our resolute contentment. Some of these we can control but others we cannot.

When my mother was diagnosed with stage-four lung cancer, my entire world collapsed. At first, the feeling I felt could only be described as numbness. I felt it in my heart wilt, but then that limp numbness soon became replaced with a revival of anger. My mother had done everything right. She always lived a healthy and conscious lifestyle. She never smoked, she exercised regularly, she rarely ate meat, and she even ate all the cancer preventing foods. So how could she be diagnosed with stage 4 lung cancer at the age of sixty-three?

As my mother went through cancer treatments from both Western and Eastern medicine, our family slowly witnessed her body deteriorate. No treatment was sufficient, as the cancer quickly spread throughout her body. Eventually, it made its way into her brain, and she suffered a stroke that left her immobile and mute. She became like an infant, needing someone to bathe, feed, and change her. She lost all control of her life.

Doctors and psychologists tested her brain capacity and concluded that it was failing. A psychologist did a simple "matching game" exercise with pictures and words to test my mom's cognitive ability. She was unable to do it. She could not comprehend words and was losing control of both her body and mind.

In the last month of her life, our minister came to visit her. As soon as he walked into my mom's room, tears started to roll down her face. The minister asked my sister and I to leave the room. While we waited outside, we pressed in, curious as to what was happening inside the hospital room.

After about twenty-five minutes, our pastor emerged and told us that they had prayed together. With tears in his eyes, he told us that my mother understood the prayer and was at peace. I was cynical, as she could not even understand me anymore. Our pastor left us.

When we re-entered the room, we saw my mom's face. Her eyes were bloodshot and glassy, her nose was red, and she had tissues scattered all over her lap and around her blankets. However, I noticed that her demeanor had changed, and for the first time since her diagnosis, I saw a sense of genuine peace on her face. For the past six months, she had been tirelessly fighting her cancer and desperately wanted to beat it. Watching her experience, it was clear to me that she was afraid to die. She had no peace.

But in her conversation and prayer with the pastor, in the midst of her terminal illness, she had been able to come to accept her death, finally finding peace with herself. She surrendered to God and was able to come to terms with the reality that she would not live much longer. She realized that the Spirit of God was within her, and found inner calm within this acceptance. Two weeks later, she passed away.

I know how difficult it is to surrender fully to the Spirit. It requires a lot from us, especially when we want so much to control, predict, and have power over our lives. But unless we surrender to the Spirit, the Spirit is not free to move in our lives. Without surrendering our desire for control and allowing the Spirit to control our lives, we are unable to move our hearts for change.

My mother surrendered to the Spirit, and the Spirit gave her a peace that no one else could offer. This grace enabled her to let go of earthly things. This peaceful grace enabled her to surrender to God.

The Spirit provides peace, grace, and mercy in our lives. As the Spirit moves, it can help us transform each other and the world. We need to allow the Spirit to enter our lives to help us release our hand. Without surrendering ourselves, it is difficult to allow the Spirit to move within our lives. Without the Spirit releasing this hand, we will not find peace, serenity, or grace in our lives.

The Holy Spirit is not like the Spirit that was part of my childhood, a Spirit that terrified me and made me assume that Christians were all crazy people. But now, we are talking about a Spirit that is vibration, light, breath, and wind, which transforms our inner selves so that we can do what is right and work for justice to make this world a kingdom of God.

### Powerful Scriptural Spirit

Christ is portrayed as “a life-giving Spirit” (1 Cor 15:45). The believer has a responsibility to live her life in the power of the Spirit (Rom 8:4–6, 14).<sup>9</sup> This responsibility should not be taken lightly, as one should not ignore the depth of the Spirit’s power. Walking in the power of the Spirit is life-changing, as the Spirit becomes an agent through which transformations can occur.

The Spirit as light and chi, a spirit of peace, gives us the energy and the power to do the work of God. We are to become the light of the world. The light does not hide under a bushel but rather shines brightly in the darkness. We are to shine brightly in this broken world to help repair the damage.

The chi is power and life-giving energy. Chi in our bodies will give us renewed life and energy to become agents of change. Chi requires us to move from the worship halls of raised hands that praise God to the realities of our broken world in desperate need of repair. Chi will give us the peace to do the healing and the repairing that is gravely needed in our world.

### Power of the Spirit to Rebuild the Earth

God is the defender of the poor and the oppressed (Jer 9:23). God did not withhold his wrath from those who harmed widows and orphans. Defending the poor and the oppressed is a commandment from God that all are required to follow and obey. We are to live it out in our lives, and God’s Spirit makes it possible.

With the Spirit’s leading, we can imagine a society that will seek sustainability and equity. We can imagine a society where the community makes decisions on how to maintain the common good and the Earth. We can recognize that all forms of capital must be considered in the notion of the good life, and the first is “nature’s capital.” The good life is dependent upon nature’s capital. We must resist the tendency to see nature as an inexhaustible commodity. We need to work towards justice as sustainability, the goals for planetary living to fulfill what Jesus meant by the reign of God.

The study of pneumatology, of the Spirit and its values, helps us understand how the Advent experience of waiting for God to come and the historical experience of remembering the God who has come amalgamate to create an open attitude towards life as a gift, renewing itself from the past and into the future. The Spirit is a movement: the Spirit, who goes between spaces, moves through the borders of space and time. The Spirit challenges us to recognize that our past and future are one and that both are important for us today.

As we engage in conversation about the Spirit, we recognize that this Spirit transforms us to become the best that we can be by our love. Love is the force that challenges us to move towards justice and wholeness. The power of the Spirit centers us and brings us into the interconnectedness of all life on Earth. We are part of creation, and creation is part of us.

Within creation is love. Love happens in different ways. Agape love will move us to move the world. Love changes our world. The love from the Spirit will empower us to work for God to be just, merciful, and to fill the world with God's love. The Spirit, the power of Eros, makes that possible. This erotic power motivates us and works through us. As we experience God's presence, we each contribute to the building of the reign of God here on Earth. It is a task that requires all of us in order to succeed. <>

## GOETHE'S FAUST AND THE DIVAN OF HAFIZ: BODY AND SOUL IN PURSUIT OF KNOWLEDGE AND BEAUTY by Hiwa Michaeli [De Gruyter, 9783110661569] [open source](#)

This book explores the poetic articulations of a shift from a transcendent to an immanent worldview, as reflected in the manner of evaluation of body and soul in Goethe's Faust and Ḥāfiẓ' Divan. Focusing on two lifeworks that illustrate their authors' respective intellectual histories, this cross-genre study goes beyond the textual confines of the two poets' Divans to compare important building blocks of their intellectual worlds.

Contents

Acknowledgement

Introduction

On the Structure of Goethe's Faust and Ḥāfiẓ's Divan and the Problem of Genre

I Direct Pursuit of Knowledge of the Transcendent Truth

I.1 Definitions and Contextualizations

I.1.1 The Representation of Knowledge in the Beginning of Faust I

I.1.2 Knowledge and Self-knowledge in Faust

I.1.3 Knowledge in the Divan of Ḥāfiẓ

I.1.4 Neoplatonic Views as the Starting Point for the Study of the Relation Between Body and Soul in Goethe's Faust and the Divan of Ḥāfiẓ

I.2 The Sun, Heavenly Bodies and the Call for Ascent in Faust

I.2.1 Direct Approach to the Transcendent: Pain, Escape and Fall

I.2.2 The Problematicization of a Method

I.2.3 Suicide as a Way of Transcending the Body

I.2.4 Flying toward the Setting Sun

I.3 Direct Approach to Knowledge of the Transcendent Truth in the Divan of Ḥāfiẓ

I.3.1 Escaping the Cage of the Body

I.3.2 The Presence of the Sun in Islamic Neoplatonism

- I.3.3 The Mote and the Sun
- I.3.4 Masīhā (Christ) and the Sun
- I.3.5 Self-Annihilation as the Last Hope for Ascent and Union
- I.4 Body and Soul in Direct Pursuit of Knowledge of the Transcendent in Goethe's Faust and the Divan of Hāfiz
  - I.4.1 Direct Negative Pursuit of Transcendent Truth
  - I.4.2 Light Metaphors and the Call for Ascent
  - I.4.3 Suicide as a Failed Method of Ascent
  - I.4.4 A Critical Look into the Method of Seeking Knowledge
- II Toward Life
  - II.1 The Process of Turning Toward Life in Faust
    - II.1.1 Reevaluations and Modifications
    - II.1.2 Painful Walls of Exclusion
    - II.1.3 The Process of Inclusion or 'Wie kommen wir denn aus dem Haus?'
  - II.2 The Turn Toward Life in the Divan of Hāfiz
    - II.2.1 Nature in Persian Poetry of the Tenth and Eleventh Centuries
    - II.2.2 The Space of Exclusion in Sa'dī and Hāfiz
    - II.2.3 Elements of Exclusion in the Sufi Tradition
    - II.2.4 Spring as a Call for Reevaluation of Exclusion
    - II.2.5 Diving into the Sea of the Wine House
    - II.2.6 Anxiety in the Field of Critique of the Old World
    - II.2.7 Mediation and Going Beyond Exclusion
  - II.3 Toward Life in Goethe's Faust and Hāfiz's Divan
    - II.3.1 Space of Exclusion
    - II.3.2 Elements of Exclusion
    - II.3.3 Influence of Spring in the Turn Toward Life
    - II.3.4 Anxiety and Leaving the Old World Behind
    - II.3.5 Mediation and Inclusion in Paradox
- III Colorful Reflections
  - III.1 The World of Reflections in Goethe's Faust
    - III.1.1 The Activity of the Faculty of Appreciation of Beauty
    - III.1.2 Within Life as the Space of Inclusion
    - III.1.3 The Articulations of Faust's Views in the World of Inclusion
    - III.1.4 Faust's Rebirth in Anmutige Gegend
    - III.1.5 Turning from the Sun to Its Colorful Reflections
    - III.1.6 Exploring the Reflections in Faust's Path to Helena
    - III.1.7 Lynceus between the Sun and Helena
  - III.2 The World of Reflections in the Divan of Hāfiz
    - III.2.1 A Historical Account of the Pursuit of Beauty in Sufism
    - III.2.2 Emanation of Beauty
  - III.3 The World of Reflections in Goethe's Faust and the Divan of Hāfiz
    - III.3.1 Beauty as the Object of Pursuit
    - III.3.2 The Mediated Immanence of the Infinite
    - III.3.3 The Communicative Aspect of the Infinite
    - III.3.4 The World as Diversification of Attributes of the One
    - III.3.5 The Active Presence of the One in the Human Being
    - III.3.6 Veils as the Medium of Disclosure
    - III.3.7 Abandoning the Self and Rejoicing in the Multiplicity
- Conclusion

### Bibliography

Excerpt: Goethe (1749–1832) received Joseph von Hammer-Purgstall's complete translation of the Divan of Ḥāfiẓ (ca. 1315–1390) in May, 1814.<sup>2</sup> Five years later, Goethe published his poetic work *West-östlicher Divan*, a text clearly influenced by Ḥāfiẓ's Divan. Many studies have explored this literary encounter from numerous perspectives. Yet the majority of these comparative literary investigations, focusing solely on issues of influence and resemblance, are restricted in scope.

They are limited to comparisons between Goethe's *West-östlicher Divan* and Ḥāfiẓ's Divan, often against the background of Goethe's study of the cultural space of the Orient as he explains in *Noten und Abhandlungen zu besserem Verständnis des West-östlichen Divans*. Muḥammad Iqbāl's productive reception of *West-östlicher Divan* in his 1923 collection of poems *Payām-i mašriqī* offers a different approach to understanding the literary encounter of 1814. In his poem *Ġalāl and Goethe*, Iqbāl expands the intercultural literary dialogue beyond Ḥāfiẓ and Goethe by widening the textual field of observation beyond the two Divans. Set in paradise, the poem depicts a meeting between Maulānā Ġalāl ud-Dīn Balḥī -yi Rūmī (Rumi) and Goethe, in which Goethe reads one of his works aloud to Rūmī. Remarkably, the work in question is not *West-östlicher Divan* – rather, it is *Faust*. Goethe's reading of *Faust* to the Persian Sufi-poet kindles an intellectual exchange between the two. *Faust* (and not *West-östlicher Divan*) reveals to Iqbāl's Rūmī the following:

Du, der Wortes Geist erfaßt,  
Die Engel jagst und Gott als Beute hast –  
Dein Denken sich im Herz verborgen hält,  
Erschafft aufs Neue dann die Alte Welt!

Considering the author's vast knowledge of both Islamic and Western philosophy, Iqbāl's poetic work lends credibility to the project of expanding our textual scope of investigation beyond *West-östlicher Divan*. As Iqbāl shows us, the dialogue between the two cultural horizons in question is not limited to *West-östlicher Divan*. Whatever the intentions of the historical Goethe may have been, Iqbāl's Goethe correctly locates this dialogue in *Faust* as well.

Several articles and short essays comparing Ḥāfiẓ's Divan and Goethe's *Faust* provide the background for the project described above. In an article published in 1966, for example, in the context of a more general comparison between the two authors, Šādiq Reżāzāde draws attention to similarities between the respective mystical outlooks articulated in the Divan of Ḥāfiẓ and Goethe's *Faust*.

Bahā' ud-Dīn Ḥorramšāhī, known for his commentary on Ḥāfiẓ's Divan and his translation of the Qur'ān into Persian, is another scholar who contributes to an expanded comparative study of Goethe and Ḥāfiẓ. Ḥorramšāhī likewise compares Ḥāfiẓ's Divan and Goethe's *Faust* (as well as *West-östlicher Divan*) in an article from 1999 that more generally compares the two authors in terms of their social and political situations, their learnedness within their respective societies, and their worldviews. Ḥorramšāhī's comparison between *Faust* and the Divan of Ḥāfiẓ operates on multiple levels.<sup>6</sup> On one level, reflecting the general framework of the article, Ḥorramšāhī focuses on the two authors themselves, arguing that the character *Faust* represents Goethe and the character 'Inspired Libertine' (rind) represents Ḥāfiẓ. The analysis then moves toward the textual level. Ḥorramšāhī draws attention to the hypertextual aspect of the character of *Faust* – half historical charlatan and trickster, half multifaceted hero – and argues for the



similarity between this characteristic of Faust and the character of Rind in Ḥāfiẓ's Divan. Rind, too, is a character with an ambivalent identity. Interpreted literally and in accordance with social historic meaning, he appears to be a base villain. Yet he also exhibits an antinomian heroic character with semiotic roots in Sufi literature.

Finally, on yet another level, Ḥorramšāhī observes a remarkable similarity between the structures of the two works. Ḥorramšāhī offers a short explanation of the style of the Divan that is based on his previous studies. He defines the style of Ḥāfiẓian ġazal as scattered (pāšān) – the verses of a given ġazal do not merely illustrate a linear development of a single theme. This style, according to Ḥorramšāhī, is Ḥāfiẓ's own innovation in ġazal and the result of the poet's studies of the Qur'ān. Ḥorramšāhī then points out that Goethe's Faust also deviates from classical unities; the thematic development of the scenes in Faust does not follow a logical, linear structure. Notably, however, Ḥorramšāhī provides no support for this claim. Furthermore, Ḥorramšāhī observes that both texts are filled with mythological, cultural, religious, and literary allusions. Yet Ḥorramšāhī admits that the comparison between the two texts requires further, in-depth investigation. His preliminary observations, particularly as they pertain to the German texts, lack sufficient textual support. Yet they suggest intriguing hypotheses and starting-points for further inquiry, such as the present study. Though not fully developed, Ḥorramšāhī's observation regarding the similar 'pāšān styles' of the Divan and Faust was an original insight – and one to which we will return.

After Ḥorramšāhī, who dedicated a small part of the aforementioned article to opening the way for a comparison between Faust and Ḥāfiẓ's Divan, Moğtabā'ī, in the article Ḥāfiẓ in Goethe's Faust, sets out to put the comparison between Faust and Ḥāfiẓ's poems in the center of focus. The author's aim is to trace possible reflections of Ḥāfiẓ's poetry in Faust and thematic resemblances between the two works. He also aims to identify other Oriental, Iranian and Islamic lines of influence. It is the first article exclusively dedicated to a comparison between Ḥāfiẓ's Divan and Faust, and it makes a remarkable contribution to the field of comparative literary studies. Yet the elements of Faust that the author selects to compare to the Divan (and its cultural and intellectual background) are treated without sufficient consideration of Faust's own cultural, literary and intellectual background. The author points out similarities between the two works but neglects to reference studies carried out on the subject by German and international scholars. His repeated identification of Mephisto with Satan, for example, disregards Goethe's explicit rejection of such an interpretation of the (much more complex) character of Mephisto. Consequently, the author identifies Mephisto with Satan without considering the drama's historical context and Goethe's own views on the possibility of representing evil in literature. In Faust I, the author assumes, Faust fights the temptations of Satan, and in Faust II, it is Satan who is overcome by Faust and is at his service. Moğtabā'ī's moral judgment of Faust's actions in Faust I leads him to make general, ahistorical statements. And Moğtabā'ī misguidedly praises Faust's project in the fifth act of Faust II as one in which Faust seeks to improve the well-being and prosperity of his people. But this interpretation decontextualizes the drama from its historical context and neglects to pay due attention to the scholarship on the subject and the theatrical context itself – the blind Faust's monologue is clearly meant to be ironic. Since the main objective of Moğtabā'ī's article is to search for and highlight possible similarities between the two texts, the author does not follow any specific and clear thematic approach. Thus, verses from Faust are picked out of context and juxtaposed to verses from Ḥāfiẓ's Divan in a way that decontextualizes both works.

Despite their shortcomings, the comparative investigations described above pave the way for future investigation and advance hypotheses that can be examined and critically evaluated in more comprehensive studies. These early studies shed light on the similarities between Ḥāfiẓ's Divan and Goethe's Faust, and they identify Ḥāfiẓ's engagement with the intellectual and ethical substance of Sufism – an essential part of Ḥāfiẓ's historical, cultural and intellectual world – as an important source of these similarities.

Though written in different historical and cultural contexts, Goethe's Faust and Ḥāfiẓ's Divan were both composed during historical periods in which the relation between body and soul was being reevaluated. Philosophical and theological speculations, new intellectual approaches, and debates concerning the definition of 'truth' as immanent (rather than radically transcendent in relation to the world and the seeker of truth) informed the authors' respective historical periods. Despite the historical and cultural distance between the two texts, the present study concentrates on this resemblance. The main question this study sets out to investigate is the following:

Is the change from a worldview based on transcendent truth to one based on immanent truth reflected in the two works in question?

Several sub-questions follow from this guiding question:

1. Are there traces of the pursuit of transcendent truth in the two texts?
2. If so, how does the pursuit of transcendent truth reflect itself in the two works in question?
3. For instance, does it reflect in the manner in which the seekers of knowledge evaluate their own bodies and souls?
4. Are there textual instances in the literary works that illustrate the experience of the seeker of truth replacing a radically transcendent worldview with an immanent one?
5. Are there literary articulations of an immanent worldview in the two texts?
6. If so, what are the specific structural elements that form the immanent worldview in each work?
7. As the radically transcendent worldview becomes an immanent one, does the method or object of pursuit change as well?

The present study contains three chapters. Each chapter is divided into two subchapters in which I separately explore different aspects of the questions posed above relative to the specific intellectual, cultural and historical contexts to which each text belongs. At the end of each chapter I will provide a close comparison between the two texts based on the detailed findings of that chapter. Thus, we are able to pay close attention to the specific historical and cultural contexts of each work, while illuminating the phenomenological resemblances between the two texts so as to show possible underlying structural similarities pertaining to the thematic focus of a given chapter.

Following the questions posed above, I remain focused on the intellectual aspect of the views reflected in both texts. With regard to the Sufi views that manifest in the Divan, my concentration will remain on the ethical, cosmological and epistemological aspects of their intellectual content in relation to questions of this study. A comparative analysis of both works with a focus on theological perspectives – for instance, the influence of specific traditions of exegesis of the Old and New Testament or the Qur'ān – lies outside the scope of this study. Rather, the concern of this study is to trace the influence of the intellectual views regarding the relation between the intelligible content of the corporeal world (the soul) and the bodily realm upon the manner of evaluation of the body and the soul in one's life. To that end, I will follow the dramatization of the life of the character Faust and the poetic descriptions of philosophical views concerning forms of life in the Divan. But discussions of life after death in the Divan, as well as the final scenes of Faust (Grablegung, Bergschluchten) that illustrate the journey of Faust's

immortal soul after death, will not be the subject of this study. They should be treated in a separate comparative study with a focus on Christian and Islamic theological traditions and conceptualizations of life after death.

Furthermore, I only discuss those scenes of Faust pertaining to a horizon of human episteme that is comparable to the intellectual horizon of Ḥāfiẓ's Divan. The fourth and the fifth acts of Faust II, therefore, which relate to modernism and Faust's colonial projects, will not be included in this treatment. In other words, I follow Faust only in his pursuit of knowledge and love; Faust's third reincarnation as the developer and colonizer remains outside of the scope of this study.

In the first chapter, I examine literary articulations of an ascending direct approach to the acquisition of knowledge and truth and I trace the influence of this epistemic view on the representation of body and soul in Faust and the Divan. To that end, I am guided by Platonic and Neoplatonic theories of transcendent truth; the relation between truth and the world; the manner of pursuit of truth; and the relation between body and soul. In addition to discussing these Neoplatonic views, in the context of Ḥāfiẓ's Divan, I discuss the intellectual and ethical teachings of early Sufis (who were, in fact, influenced by Neoplatonism) in relation to the subject of the first chapter (i.e., the transcendent truth). First, I dedicate a section to clarifying the mode of knowledge present in the two texts, relative to their respective cultural and historical backgrounds. I explain the relevance of Neoplatonic views in this context. In both texts, I trace the influence of a worldview based on the radical transcendence of truth from the natural and sublunary realm. I show that the pursuit of knowledge within this worldview entails a Platonic exclusion of the material, bodily and natural realms in which the purified seeker of knowledge directly ascends to the extramundane truth. I demonstrate that this view manifests in metaphors of light and representations of the sun and the moon. In both texts, I locate textual instances in which the sun represents, metaphorically, the transcendent object of pursuit. Seekers of such knowledge, I argue, wish to fly directly toward this object, leaving the natural and the bodily spheres behind. Regarding expressions of striving directly toward the extramundane source of knowledge,

I locate in both texts indications of the impossibility of a radically negative and direct pursuit of the transcendent – an approach that is destructive to life itself and that causes pain and alienation from the world. I argue that the Faust drama exhibits a cycle of pain, escape into fantasy, and experience of disillusionment. This cycle contributes to the text's dramatic development, including Faust's attempt at suicide. The experiences of pain of the ascending seeker of knowledge are interwoven with a growing awareness of the necessity of rethinking the natural and bodily spheres as well as the relation between divine truth and the world. Assessing the critiques of the method of the pursuit of truth in both texts is the subject of the second chapter.

In the second chapter, I investigate the literary illustration of the shift from the pursuit of the transcendent truth to the pursuit of immanent truth in Ḥāfiẓ's Divan and Goethe's Faust. To highlight the literary articulations of this process, I first probe the texts for descriptions of the world constructed in accordance with the view of truth as radically transcendent. Then, with a clear view of the characteristics of this initial state – i.e., the state that will undergo the shift I've described above – I focus on the process itself. I show how Faust's academic title ('Doktor') and his study (Studierzimmer) represent a world characterized by an exclusive worldview as well as the practice of negation and purification of the natural and the bodily spheres. I analyze Faust's expressions of discontent with the world that surrounds him. In this context, I point out the ways in which Neoplatonic views are modified in both texts; in case of the Divan, I also address Ḥāfiẓ's polemics against elements of ascetic Sufism

based on the radical transcendence of the divine truth. In this chapter, I trace Faust's shifting views regarding truth – namely, whether his pursuit of truth requires mediation or not. I also explain the metaphorical role of colors in Faust and argue that verse 1120 describes the emerging turn toward life and a mediated approach to the object of pursuit in an immanent worldview. Furthermore, in this chapter, I differentiate between Mephisto's actions and the intentions that he voices in Faust's absence. Based on this differentiation, I advance an interpretation of Mephisto as a mediating figure who, through his actions, guides Faust through his own process of change. In both texts, the mediating figures help the respective character's transition from an exclusive worldview to an inclusive one. I argue that this function is vividly present in Ḥāfiẓ's mediating figure, Pir-i Muğān. Furthermore, I show that the mediating figures in Faust and the Divan both make use of the potentialities of paradox to overcome the binary view that anchors the practice of exclusion and negative ascension. Detecting the immanence of the divine in the natural and colorful beauty of spring, I identify spring's beauty and its aesthetic appreciation as a component of the rejection of a radically transcendent worldview. The importance of beauty and love, a central theme of the third chapter, is denoted in the title of this study. I argue in the third chapter that the increasing importance of beauty does not mean that the pursuit of knowledge loses its significance. The attempts to justify the pursuit of beauty and its appreciation in love reflect that they are corollaries of an intellectual turn toward a principally immanent worldview.

The third chapter explores the immanent worldviews poetically articulated in the two texts. Goethe's studies of Spinoza's Ethics that were influenced by Herder inform my reading of Faust in this chapter. I show that, instead of directly pursuing the transcendent truth, Faust pursues beauty and love in the drama by comprehending natural and human beings as reflections of the One, the immanent divine, in the world. My analysis of Faust in this chapter also refers to Goethe's dramatic fragment Pandora, his lyrical works in Westöstlicher Divan, and other poems dedicated to the poetic articulation of his worldviews.

As for Ḥāfiẓ's Divan, I investigate the relevance of the Sufi views regarding immanence of the divine in the world. I refer to instances in the early history of Sufism in which Sufi adherents, worshipping beauty, integrate the adoration of human beauty into their process of self-development and pursuit of knowledge of the divine. Later, Sufism turned to reject an understanding of divine truth as absolutely transcendent and began conceptualizing it as immanent in relation to the realm of the multiplicity and nature. In the third chapter, I identify intertextual links between the poetry of Ḥāfiẓ, and two important Sufi treatises on love written by Aḥmad Ġazzālī, and Faḥr ud-Dīn 'Irāqī. I trace this intertextual link based on the terms that the Divan shares with the works of these two Sufi masters. Furthermore, I describe the relation between the pursuit of beauty and a mediated immanence of the One, the being that is referred to as the Beloved in this context. In Faust and Ḥāfiẓ's Divan, I show that, in place of the quest of ascension and separation of the body from the soul, the pursuit of beauty involves the mediated immanence of the One in the form of its reflected images.

In this chapter, I show that the light metaphors function differently. In both texts, I observe instances of hyperbole that denigrate the sun in the face of physical, human beauty. In addition to pointing out the differences between the two texts, I show the underlying structural similarities between their respective representations of immanence. I show that the immanent worldview in both texts is based on a monistic view that explains the relation between the One and the many. This monistic view conceives the One as the ontological ground of the many; in turn, the many are recognized to be mediated reflections and images of the One. The underlying structure of this worldview, I argue, encompasses three sets of relation: the One and the world; the One and humans; and humans and the world.

The following study, however, does not investigate influences of Ḥāfiẓ's Oriental cultural space on Goethe's *Faust*. The study at hand is a purely phenomenological literary study; it sets out to explore the two texts in their own contexts and to find literary articulations relevant to the relation between body and soul with regards to the acquisition of knowledge.

Before turning to the two texts, I briefly discuss the issue of genre in Goethe's dramatic work (written almost entirely in verse) and Ḥāfiẓ's lyrical *Divan*. Ḥorramšāhī's study of the structural similarities between *Faust* and Ḥāfiẓ's *Divan* is the first treatment of the difference of genre of these two texts. In the following section, I further explore the problem of genre in Goethe's *Faust* and Ḥāfiẓ's *Divan*. I elucidate the structural features of these texts that enable my cross-genre reading and comparison.

## In Sum

In the first chapter, I explored Faust's wish to attain knowledge. At first glance, this wish takes the form of the desire to grasp the immanence of the divine forces that hold the world (universe) together. Yet the immanence of the transcendent divine truth in nature appears not to have deep roots in Faust's view of the world. The constant presence of the heavenly bodies in Faust's speculative fantasies provides the first clues about the roots of Faust's Neoplatonic wish for ascension beyond the realm of matter. The wish for ascent – the wish to fly directly toward the heavenly bodies, as in verses 391–397, 418 and 702–705 – clearly indicates Faust's desire to leave the earthly realm behind. The heavenly bodies are metaphors for Faust's Neoplatonic approach to the transcendent, which prescribes 'cleansing' the soul and the senses of all that is mundane and material.

But Faust's excluding worldview in the early part of the drama is not shared by Goethe, whose poetic translation of the *Ennead* I. 6. 9 conspicuously omits one of the central elements of Plotinus's philosophy – the process of purification. After failing to grasp the 'Erdgeist', Faust finds the fault in his human condition. His Platonic conception of the human condition reveals the deep roots of a negative, excluding method of attainment of knowledge. Faust's body – the material component of his being – is the greatest obstacle on his path of ascent to knowledge.

Vividly articulated near the end of the scene *Vor dem Tor*, when Faust (famously) describes himself as possessing two souls, this view of the body accords with Plotinus's notion of 'secondary evil', which states that the body hinders the divine nucleus of the human being from separating itself from its corporeal component. In the scene *Vor dem Tor*, the sight of the setting sun kindles Faust's desire for ascent, which Faust justifies in reference to the doctrine of *anamnesis*, according to which the sight of the elevated and the sublime activates an inborn memory of a home, to which one can ascend only by separating the soul from the corporeal sphere.

In the *Divan*, I discussed *ghazals* 334 and 478 as examples of the dominance of the ascending, negative view of approaching the transcendent truth. In contrast to the *pāšān* style of many of Ḥāfiẓ's poems, these two poems, written without irony or sarcasm, are characterized by the linear development of a single theme.<sup>3</sup> Both poems describe the body and its desires as impediments on the ascending path toward truth, and prescribe negation and purification of the soul. Like Faust, Ḥāfiẓ's *Divan* describes the heavenly bodies as the destination of ascent, and the sight of the heavenly bodies as the impetus to ascend.

*Anamnesis* appears to be a component of this view in the *Divan*; Ḥāfiẓ describes his soul as a bird (a nightingale or a falcon) trapped in the cage of the body with a memory of its homeland, the source of

goodness and truth. In both texts, the journey of the descended individuated soul back to its place of origin ultimately entails the elimination of the individual. But neither Faust nor the narrator of the Divan takes this radical step: in Faust, the song of the angels and childhood memories of feeling close to the divine pull Faust back from the ledge; and in the Divan, the poet conveys that he does not consider his life to be at his disposal. I argued that Ḥāfiẓ's arguments in this case resemble those of Socrates in *Phaedo*. In addition, Ḥāfiẓ argues that offering one's life to the unchanging origin of being is pointless; by definition, the unchanging realm is unaffected by the sacrifice. Thus, the human being does not ascend to the transcendent realm on the basis of merit; he does so only through mercy, which is best exemplified by Christ, who is purified from the mundane by the grace of the divine – only *Masīḥā* and whomever else the divine chooses can ascend to the most transcendent truth. In the section 'Masīḥā (Christ) and the Sun', I explained the role of mercy through the poet's use of the sun as a metaphor for the purest extramundane object of pursuit.

In the scene *Nacht*, we find Faust trapped in a vicious cycle: pain leads him to seek escape in speculative fantasy, which quickly turns to disillusionment – and more pain. Eventually, Faust attempts to escape this cycle once and for all through suicide. In the Divan, this dramatic illustration of the state before change cannot be expected.

In the Divan, Ḥāfiẓ uses sarcasm and irony to refute ascetic abstraction of the sublime from the mundane. Expressions of acceptance and appreciation of the human condition in the Divan mark Ḥāfiẓ's rejection of an excluding approach to the bodily realm. In *ġazal* 399, we find the poetic narrator – a mouthpiece for Ḥāfiẓ himself – critique the hypocrisy of asceticism and glorify the human condition. In *ġazal* 351, the *pārsāyān* are differentiated from the *tāzyān* through their sympathy for the human condition and ability to introduce joy into Ḥāfiẓ's pursuit of truth. The *pārsāyān* bear a strong resemblance to the magi, and specifically the *Pir-i Muḡān*, who appears as the mediating figure in the Divan, as I discussed in the second chapter of this study.

In chapter two, I explored the shift from an excluding approach to the bodily and the natural sphere toward an embrace of life and nature. I demonstrated that the institution of knowledge that Faust criticizes in the scene *Nacht* is based on the practice of exclusion in accordance with the negative view of transcendence. I argued that Faust's study excludes him from the outside world; in place of the living natural phenomena outside its walls, Faust's study contains lifeless representations of nature as never-changing objects of exploration.<sup>6</sup> Faust's academic degrees exclude him from the realm of nature and act as subjective extensions of the walls of his study; thus, even when Faust leaves his study in the scene *Vor dem Tor*, he is still metaphorically trapped within it. In contrast to his descriptions of his study in the scene *Nacht*, Faust describes his study in *Studierzimmer* [I] as a hermitage in which the inner light of the extramundane source of life can be appreciated. This scene opens a window to Faust's past. While Faust suppresses his experiences of pain, on the theatrical level, the struggling poodle casts light on the excluding function of Faust's study.

To show Ḥāfiẓ's turn from an excluding worldview toward life and natural beauty, I discussed the respective representations of nature in Persian literature before and after the dominance of Sufism by comparing the poetry of Rūdakī and Manūčihri to Sa'dī's *ġazals* and several poems in Ḥāfiẓ's Divan. Whereas the works of the earlier poets contain vivid illustrations of natural phenomena, the latter poets juxtapose the space of *ḥalvat* (solitude) to the perishable beauty of nature. This space is described as a refuge for the ideal forms of ephemeral beauty, where the wise can enjoy their liberation from the pain

of perishable beauty of the world. After demonstrating the relevance of Sufi views to the concept of ḥalvat, I briefly explained several of the elements and terms of ascetic Sufism: the subjective elements of tauba (repentance) and ṭahārat (purification); and the objective elements of ḥānaqāh (convent) and ḥirqa (the Sufi tattered frock). With respect to the Divan, I demonstrated that the experience of nature – and specifically, spring – leads the poet to recognize an immanent, invigorating force present in all beings. I argued that Ḥāfiẓ articulates his integration into the natural sphere through an anthropomorphic analogy; he defends his inclination to enjoy natural beauty on ground that this inclination is universal. Having experienced nature, the poet uses irony to express his skepticism toward the excluding elements of the ascetic Sufi method, specifically the notion of repentance. Alluding to the poetry of Rūdakī, Ḥāfiẓ refers to the ‘repentance-shattering spring’, whose cosmic display of immanence refutes the logic of exclusion; the poet finds it irrational to prefer solitude over celebrating the beauty of spring.<sup>8</sup> Spring provides the backdrop for ḡazal 338, in which Ḥāfiẓ places his human condition above the heavenly sun; instead of wishing to ascend to the sun, Ḥāfiẓ describes descending into a bottomless sea, which he compares to a wine-house, in pursuit of the pearl of love. Again, in ḡazal 414, Ḥāfiẓ struggles to decide between inclusion and exclusion in a bizarre setting – in front of a pleasure house. He reminds the ‘youthful vintner’, who plays the role of the reproachful ascetic, that spring itself is an argument against a negative approach to truth.

In Faust, too, the arrival of spring has a significant role. Faust’s monologue in verses 903–940 extends the uninterrupted immanence of the divine to the natural and the human realms. I argued that, in this monologue, Faust modifies his view of the relation between the colors and the light of the sun in accordance with the immanent world that he envisions; he no longer views color as polluted light. It is also in the spring that Faust recognizes that his knowledge fails to grasp the dark unknown of the excluded natural realm. Based on Blumenberg’s theory of the experience of horizon, I explained Faust’s self-description of his state in verses 1064–1065 as one in which he is submerged in a sea of errors; his entire accumulated knowledge is cast into doubt.

In the Divan of Ḥāfiẓ, I showed how the poet’s inner struggles emerge from his rejection of the values that had shaped his world previously – namely, the values of ascetic Sufism and Platonism. Unable to ignore the beauty of spring, Ḥāfiẓ sarcastically attacks the theory of purification and exclusion of the natural realm; he describes the ḥānaqāh as a snare and a trap, rather than a fortress of spiritual and intellectual safety. Symbolically, he wishes to wash with wine the parchments filled with false knowledge. He discredits the Sufi mentors, faqīhs and muftīs as agents of the ḥānaqāh and madrasa, corrupt institutions in which charlatanism and hypocrisy masquerade as knowledge and self-development.

Regarding the rejection of negative worldviews, another important topic of this study has been the role of mediating figures, which appear in both texts. Whereas in Faust, Faust’s process of reevaluation of his conception of mediation is dramatized in several steps, the Divan does not contain a linear representation of Ḥāfiẓ’s changing approach to mediation. On many occasions, the Divan emphasizes the role of mediation in the process of turning toward an inclusive approach to the natural realm. In the case of Faust, I argued that it is necessary to differentiate between Mephisto’s deeds and intentions. Mephisto’s evil traits, I argued, must be understood in reference to the negative views of Faust’s old world and the anxieties that arose from them. This connection becomes clear when we compare Mephisto’s speeches directed to the audience (in Faust’s absence) to Wagner’s cautionary monologue at the end of the scene Vor dem Tor. I also discussed Mephisto’s acts of mediation, which lead Faust to leave the house that symbolizes his old way of life.

Mephisto's conflict with Faust's house dramatizes the symbolic opposition between the mediator (Mephisto, both as poodle and person) and the excluding space (the house). Finally, Faust and Mephisto's departure from Faust's study at the end of Studierzimmer [II] marks Mephisto's success as a mediator and his victory over the excluding elements of Faust's world. In case of the Divan, Ḥāfiẓ's mediating figure takes the form of Pīr-i Muḡān, an eclectic fictive mentor based on theological, philosophical and Sufi views known to Ḥāfiẓ. The mediating figure in the Divan of Ḥāfiẓ contrasts to the mediating figures of both Sufis and philosophers: Ḥāfiẓ's mediating figure is neither the personal mentor envisioned by the Sufis nor the anthropomorphic representation of the Active Intelligence envisioned by philosophers such as Ibn Sīnā and Suhrawardī. In both Faust and the Divan of Ḥāfiẓ, the mediating figures use paradox and oxymora to nullify the binary logic that is the basis of the process of purification. In Faust, this process begins in Studierzimmer [I] with Mephisto's paradoxical self-presentation. In Studierzimmer [II], Mephisto actively leads Faust to partake in life and accept both pain and pleasure. Mephisto also leads Faust to abandon his self-deifying wish for death and to accept his human condition as the combination of the spiritual and material spheres ('Tag und Nacht') in accordance with divine will. In the Divan, Ḥāfiẓ's mentor helps him transcend the duality of purification and pollution. He teaches Ḥāfiẓ that the human notions of good and evil are not valid from the perspective of the divine ('ināyat). Hence, one cannot achieve ascension by means of ascetic purification and self-mortification, since these are practices grounded in human values. In light of Ḥorramšāhī's discussion of Ṭḡī's remarks on the issue of the presence of evil in the sublunary realm, I further explained that Ḥāfiẓ's mentor argues that evil contributes to the totality of phenomena; as contributing parts, evil and goodness coexist in particular phenomena – but the evil part never outweighs the good part. Aided by his mentor, Ḥāfiẓ attests to the beauty of nature (which also contains pain) and thus abandons his excluding views.

A conspicuous difference between Faust and the Divan is that Faust challenges his mediating figure, whereas the narrator of the Divan does not. This difference can be explained in light of different genres of the two works. Faust's struggle with Mephisto dramatizes his critique of his old worldviews and his difficulty leaving his old world. In the Divan, on the other hand, the relation between Ḥāfiẓ and his mentor, Pīr-i Muḡān, is nurturing, rather than hostile.

Pīr-i Muḡān educates Ḥāfiẓ intellectually and spiritually. As a pupil of Pīr-i Muḡān, Ḥāfiẓ articulates his critiques of ascetic exclusion through ironic selfcriticism and sarcastic attacks on the institutions of the madrasa, ḥānaqāh and the intolerant morality police (muḥtasib).

In the third chapter, I explored the immanent worldviews that, in both texts, replace the exclusive world views discussed above. The first consequence of the turn from an exclusive to an inclusive worldview is the increased importance of the beauty as the object of pursuit. The first decisive event in Faust's new 'Lebenslauf' is his experience of beauty in the magic mirror of the Hexenküche – this is the moment in which Faust becomes a lover. In the Divan of Ḥāfiẓ, we find the poet's praise of beauty constantly intertwined with his sarcastic critiques of ascetic Sufi views. Moreover, Ḥāfiẓ's poems on love and beauty justify the significance of beauty and explain the relation between the divine and the one who appreciates beauty. In Goethe's Faust, the sublime aspect of that which is aesthetically moving is inseparable from its worldly aspect. In his pursuit of beauty and love, Faust constantly explains why the beautiful appears beautiful to him; how it affects him; and how love and beauty have their ground in the immanence of the divine. The investigations of the third chapter yield the following result: in both works, love and the appreciation of beauty are informed by an organic immanent worldview based on



the constellation of (a) the world, (b) humans and (c) the divine. By repeatedly revisiting this theme from various perspectives, Goethe and Ḥāfiẓ are able to articulate different aspects of the connection among these three components of the immanent worldview. In the *Divan*, Ḥāfiẓ employs numerous metaphors and allegories in order to illustrate and justify the appreciation of beauty. But his use of different sets of metaphors and allegories, [The sets of metaphors in question are those of intoxication (wine, goblet, the vintner, the wine bringer, the drunkard); the imagery of the beauty of the beloved (eye, eyebrow, mole, cheek, down, tress); and the light metaphors.] often in an interwoven manner, presents a challenge for the reader. I discussed *ḡazals* in which Ḥāfiẓ brings one set of metaphors (and one component of his worldview) to the foreground, while leaving others in the background. By analyzing these *ḡazals*, as well as others in which more than one set of metaphors (and more than one component of Ḥāfiẓ's worldview) are present, I was able to illuminate the immanent worldview that finds articulation in the *Divan*; understanding the *Divan*'s intertextual relations with other relevant texts also advanced that goal.

In Goethe's *Faust*, Faust's soliloquies, disputations with Mephisto and conversations with Gretchen reveal Goethe's own theories of love and beauty. Furthermore, the theme of the pursuit of love is dramatized twice in *Faust* –first in the case of Gretchen, and second in the Helena act. Gretchen's love is further alluded to in the scenes *Hochgebirg* and *Bergschluchten*.

The core principle of the immanent worldviews in the *Divan* of Ḥāfiẓ and Goethe's *Faust* rests in the recognition that the One contains two aspects. The first aspect, the absolute essence of uniqueness, is in itself and for itself; the second aspect is oriented toward multiplicity and diversification. This second aspect is the basis of the One's uninterrupted active immanence, which operates on two levels in both the *Divan* and *Faust*: (a) the active, mediated immanence of the One in the world as its self-diversifications and self-disclosures through its numerous attributes, images and reflections that instantiate beauty; and (b) the active, mediated immanence of the communicative aspect of the One in humans.

The non-communicative aspect of the divine lies beyond the reach of the intellect and aesthetic appreciation. In the *Divan*, this non-communicative aspect of the One is referred to as *ẓāt* ('the essence'). In the metaphorical imagery of love, the non-communicative aspect is represented by the mole of the Beloved, and the communicative aspect is represented by the face of the Beloved. The face of the Beloved is compared to the sun as the source of emanation. Like the sun, the face cannot be seen directly, but its mediated immanence can be appreciated in the world. I elaborated on this point in the *Divan* in reference to A. Ḡazzālī's distinction between the beauty (*ḥusn*) and belovedness (*malāḥat*) of the Beloved; I showed that this distinction appears in Ḥāfiẓ's work. Regarding the essence of the One, I showed that Faust's admission of the ineffability of the source of his love for Gretchen accords with Goethe's view, expressed in *Prooemion*, that the essence of the Infinite, too, is ineffable. In his monologue praising the arrival of spring, Faust expresses the sun's willingness to diversify its light in colors and to extend its being into the multiplicity of nature. On another level, the sun's influence also extends to human beings. The communicative act of the sun illustrates Goethe's universal conception of 'Anmut', according to which the quality of 'Anmut' applies (universally) to nature, humans and art. The scene *Anmutige Gegend* dramatizes the influence of 'Anmut' (immanent in nature) on Faust's body and mind; in the scene *Rittersaal* we observe the influence of 'Anmut' working within the work of art; and, finally, in Chiron's description of Helena, the human form of 'Anmut' is described as having an effect on Faust.

One of the corollaries of the communicative aspect of the One is the mediated immanence that is communicated from the One to the world and that unites the One with its many reflections and images.<sup>20</sup> Both texts consider the image of the One in a given phenomenon to be the ontological ground of that phenomenon. I argued that the ‘disclosure of the ray of beauty of the Beloved’ in ‘Irāqī’s poetry modifies the Neoplatonic view of the emanation of the Intellect; I also showed that Ḥāfiẓ in *ġazal* 148 uses the ‘disclosure of the ray of beauty’ in the same sense as ‘Irāqī does in his poem. In *ġazals* 87 and 148, I explained the diversification of the One in instantiations of Its attributes using ‘Irāqī’s definition of *ġayrat*. ‘Irāqī does not define the phenomena as entities other (*ġayr*) than the One (a definition that belongs to the exclusive Sufi doctrine). Rather, he defines them as many likenesses (*a‘yān*) of the One, each of which instantiates an attribute or several attributes of the One. Thus, whereas in ascetic Sufism *ġayrat* is a force of exclusion, in ‘Irāqī’s *Lama‘āt* it becomes a formative force that diversifies the One in the multiplicity of Its attributes. I then showed that Ḥāfiẓ grasps perceivable qualities of phenomena – the fragrance and colors of flowers, the straight growth of a cypress tree, the light of a candle – as instantiations of the attributes of the One, whose likeness (*‘ayn*) in a given phenomenon constitutes its ontological ground. In *Faust*, each entity that Faust recognizes as beautiful is conceived by Faust as an image of one indeterminate entity. Furthermore, Faust defines the influence of beauty of each image as an extension of the influence of that indeterminate entity. In the scene *Marthens Garten*, Faust frames his view of the divine in terms of Its inclusion of the multiplicity; the divine is the ‘Allumfasser’ and ‘Allerhalter’, whose immanence constitutes the qualities of phenomena and enables humans to recognize the All in everything.

The immanence of the One is the ontological ground of finite phenomena; this is true of human beings as well. The image of the One that is the ontological ground of humans is at the same time the human faculty that recognizes the diversifications of the Indeterminate in Its determinate instantiations.

Both Goethe’s letter to Auguste zu Stolberg of 1775 and the scene *Wald und Höhle* describe recognizing natural phenomena as one’s own brethren. Through comparing these two texts, I argued that this epistemological aspect of immanence is extended from being limited to recognizing the likeness in other humans (Goethe’s letter) to an all-inclusive faculty of recognition of the likeness of the One in natural phenomena (*Wald und Höhle*). Faust recognizes nature as his brethren, since natural phenomena also contain an image of the divine – similar to the image that he contains. This image constitutes humanity and actively appreciates and loves the beauty of similar images. I located this epistemological immanent worldview in Herder’s *Übers Erkennen und Empfinden in der menschlichen Seele* and argued that Herder also viewed the image of the divine as the ontological ground of the human being. The active immanence of the One in human beings has another articulation in *Faust* – one that can be appreciated in reference to Goethe’s view, expressed in his *Farbenlehre*, of the inner activity of the eye in the context of physiological colors. I showed this active immanence in Faust’s inner activity in front of the magic mirror and in his inclusion of the darkness and absolute emptiness of the abode of Mothers. The physiological component of Goethe’s immanent worldview has no direct parallel in the *Divan* of Ḥāfiẓ. Yet, as I have argued, this component is an extension of the ontological and epistemological components of Goethe’s immanent worldview, which do find parallels in the *Divan*.

In my discussion of the *Divan*, I explained the metaphor of the world-revealing cup, and I introduced the active immanence of the One in the human heart as the faculty of recognizing the Beloved in all the beauties (beloveds) in the world. I explained this active immanence in reference to *Sawāniḥ*, *Lama‘āt* and *ġazal* 178 of the *Divan*. I then demonstrated that the eye and the heart are intimately connected in

the Divan; in many cases they appear to be almost identical. The image of the Beloved that resides in the human heart is actively present in the eye, which recognizes the likeness of the Beloved in the multiplicity of phenomena. In my explanation of the phrase ‘mardum-i dīda,’ a calque of the Arabic ‘insān ul-‘ayn’ (pupil of the eye), I argued that the image of the Beloved reflected in the pupil of the eye is a metaphor for the immanence of the One in human beings. This notion is conveyed through the word ‘ayn, meaning ‘essence’, ‘likeness’, and ‘the eye’. On the basis of this analysis, I clarified the poet’s anthropomorphic illustration of the insān ul-‘ayn (pupil) in the sixth couplet of ġazal 385 in the Divan. Using anthropomorphism, Ḥāfiẓ tersely depicts the connection between the eye and the heart, which is the space where the Beloved is active in the lover (the human being) and recognizes Her own diversifications in the beloveds of the world.

Whereas anamnestic epistemology defines the body as an obstacle to attaining truth, the immanent worldviews that find articulation in both texts view the body as the field in which the transcendent extends its active immanence by way of images and reflections. Unlike the anamnestic wish to ascend beyond the phenomenal world, the immanent epistemology in our two texts is based on the mediated activity of the One in humans, which recognizes particulars as instantiations of the attributes of the One.

Based on the communicative aspect of the One and Its will to disclose Itself in the multiplicity of phenomena, I showed that the two texts offer similar assessments of veils. In the Divan, I explained the extension of the communicative aspect of the One in reference to ‘Irāqī’s argument in Lama‘āt: the One, ‘Irāqī argues, cannot be limited by the finite; rather, It limits Itself, as an artist does, in the veils of the finite in order to communicate particular aspects of its Indeterminate Self. Thus, the world is a work of art, and humans are its spectators. In this context, Love is depicted as a minstrel; as a painter, constantly painting self-portraits from countless different perspectives; and as a beautifier that conveys Itself in phenomena and appreciates Itself through Its active immanence in humans (lovers). In the Divan, human art is praised in reference to the works of the divine artist. Extolling his mastery in minstrelsy and poetry in hyperbolic terms, Ḥāfiẓ describes the influence of his work on humans, heavenly bodies and angels.

In the scene Anmutige Gegend, Faust describes the landscape before him as the realm of ‘the most youthful veils’. I explained this phrase in reference to Goethe’s aphorism: the Indefinite willingly limits Itself in order to render finite beings in Its likeness. I also pointed to another instance of grasping the veil as a medium of unveiling in West-östlicher Divan – namely, in Suleika’s ability to recognize ‘das Allgegenwärtige’ behind its ‘magical veils’.

In both works, I argued, the pursuit of unity with the transcendent that necessitates self-annihilation is replaced by the pursuit of the mediated presence of the One in the multiplicity of phenomena, and particularly in humans themselves. The emergence of this new, immanent worldview represents a compromise, which is articulated in both texts through oxymora: ‘Wechsel-Dauer’ (in Faust) and the ‘assembly of dispersion’ (in the Divan). ‘Wechsel-Dauer’ represents Faust’s self-knowledge in his realization that he is an image of the sun – a quality that he shares with other phenomena. Referring to the realm of multiplicity as the colorful reflections of the sun is a clear instance of the modification of light metaphors in accordance with the immanent worldviews explained thus far. Faust’s integration in the ‘Wechsel-Dauer’ resembles Hafiz’s conception of the world as the multiplicity of likenesses of the Beloved in the Divan. In chapter three, I showed the modifications made to the light metaphors in Faust, in which Gretchen and Helena are elevated above the sun and the heavenly bodies; I demonstrated that

this representation of the beloved is similar to the sun analogies in the Divan, specifically in Purgstall's translation, which Goethe read.

In this study, I limited my comparison between Goethe's Faust and the Divan of Ḥāfiẓ to the parts of Faust relevant to the turn from a transcendent to an immanent worldview – namely, Faust's quests for knowledge, beauty and love. Acts four and five of Faust, which dramatize his colonialist reincarnation, did not fall within the scope of this study. Furthermore, my study was limited to a comparison between the two texts, rather than the two authors. In light of the lack of information about Ḥāfiẓ's life, generalizing the findings of this comparative study to the two authors themselves would be purely speculative.

The detailed findings of this study provide a basis for critically evaluating Goethe's attempts to understand the intellectual world of Ḥāfiẓ in the *Noten und Abhandlungen zum besseren Verständnis des West-östlichen Divans*; they also provide a basis for further analysis of Ḥāfiẓ's reception in the writings of the nineteenth-century orientalists and philosophers.

Throughout this study of Faust, we encountered the concept of God-likeness ('Gottesebenbildlichkeit') on multiple occasions and in various forms – being the equal of gods; being a god; and being an image of the divine. This notion appears frequently in the Divan; it relates to the image of the Beloved in the mirror of the lover's heart and the image of the Wine-Bringer in the cup. Furthermore, the frequently used metaphor of the pupil of the eye (*insān ul-'ayn*) in the Divan also alludes to the concept of God-likeness.

In this study, I mentioned the importance of the concept of God-likeness to the immanent worldviews of the two works. But a thorough comparison of the concept of God-likeness in the two works is a project for a future study. This future study should be carried out in reference to the two cultural contexts in question and should take into account, the theological and intellectual extensions of this Judeo-Christian notion and its Neoplatonic parallel, both of which are actively present in Sufism and thus in the cultural space of the Divan.

## **EXERCISE OF POWER: AMERICAN FAILURES, SUCCESSES, AND A NEW PATH FORWARD IN THE POST-COLD WAR WORLD** by Robert M. Gates. [Alfred A. Knopf, 9781524731885] Other titles: **AMERICA AND THE POST-COLD WAR WORLD**

From the former secretary of defense and author of the acclaimed #1 best-selling memoir, *Duty*, a candid, sweeping examination of power in all its manifestations, and how it has been exercised, for good and bad, by American presidents in the post-Cold War world.

Since the end of the Cold War, the global perception of the United States has progressively morphed from dominant international leader to disorganized entity, seemingly unwilling to accept the mantle of leadership or unable to govern itself effectively. Robert Gates argues that this transformation is the result of the failure of political leaders to understand the complexity of American power, its expansiveness, and its limitations. He makes clear that the successful exercise of power is not limited to the use of military might or the ability to coerce or demand submission, but must encompass as well

diplomacy, economics, strategic communications, development assistance, intelligence, technology, ideology, and cyber. By analyzing specific challenges faced by the American government in the post-Cold War period--Iran, Iraq, Afghanistan, North Korea, Syria, Libya, Russia, China, and others--Gates deconstructs the ways in which leaders have used the instruments of power available to them. With forthright judgments of the performance of past presidents and their senior-most advisers, firsthand knowledge, and insider stories, Gates argues that U.S. national security in the future will require learning, and abiding by, the lessons of the past, and re-creating those capabilities that the misuse of power has cost the nation.

## Review

"[Gates's] tone is judicious and nonpartisan, and he grades all the administrations fairly according to his standards of professional competence. . . The familiar stories gain new life and interest when told by somebody who's been in the room where it happens. Gates says what he thinks and refuses to pull his punches and, as a result, the book offers in one volume the most accurate record available of recent American security policy, the most incisive critique of that policy and the most sensible guide to what should come next."—**Gideon Rose, *The New York Times Book Review***

"Accessible. . . This important work dives deep into the past three decades of American foreign policy to provide a realistic picture of how key policy decisions were crafted. Highly recommended for those wanting an examination of America's role within the global community."—**Jacob Sherman, *Library Journal*, starred review**

"An incisive treatise. . . [Gates is] both a sharp critic of Washington D.C.'s policy-making bureaucracies and a shrewd analyst of the dilemmas they wrestle with. The result is a judicious yet bracingly contrarian take on military and foreign policy from the ultimate insider."—***Publishers Weekly***

"Recent political leaders, Gates holds, have failed to understand and project American power properly. . . It's refreshing to see a secretary of defense call for the use of the military as a choice of last resort."—***Kirkus***

"Powerful . . . timely. . . Everything [Gates has] consistently advocated – moderation of ambition; realistic expectations; recognition of the limitation of our military power; a desire for sensible long-term engagement – is on display in this volume as a cautionary tale. . . We are far from becoming a defeated or a declining power – but without the prescription that Secretary Gates lays out in *Exerciser of Power*, we might become one."—**Admiral James Stavridis, author of *Sailing True North***

"In a time of global instability, perhaps our nation's most distinguished public servant, Robert M. Gates, has given us a compelling, thought-provoking, and much-needed assessment of how we got here—and what must be done to restore and extend the best of American power."—**Jon Meacham, author of *The Soul of America***

"The mastery with which Robert Gates wrestles with the fundamental question of the purposes to which America's global power should be used reveals an astonishing combination of strengths — a narrative gift that captivates the reader from start to finish, an insightful mind, and a profound wisdom that comes from his own experience and wide-ranging historical knowledge."—**Doris Kearns Goodwin, author of *Leadership***

*“Exercise of Power* is a timely, essential guide for all those committed to sustaining America’s experiment in democracy. It should also be required reading for anyone engaged in crafting, influencing and (especially) executing American foreign policy. It is truly a page-turner.”—**General Jim Mattis, coauthor, *Call Sign Chaos***

- Contents
- Prologue
- CHAPTER 1 The Symphony of Power
- CHAPTER 2 Exercising Power
- CHAPTER 3 Iran: Great Satan’s Bane
- CHAPTER 4 Somalia, Haiti, and the Yugoslav Wars: Good Intentions and the Road to Hell
- CHAPTER 5 Colombia: The Plan That Worked (Mostly)
- CHAPTER 6 Afghanistan: War Without End CHAPTER 7 Iraq: A Curse
- CHAPTER 8 Africa: A Success Story CHAPTER 9 Russia: Opportunity Missed?
- CHAPTER 10 Georgia, Libya, Syria, and Ukraine: To Intervene or Not to Intervene
- CHAPTER 11 North Korea: Crazy Like a Fox
- CHAPTER 12 China: Competition, Conflict, or Something New?
- CHAPTER 13 Lessons Learned
- Acknowledgments Notes
- Bibliography
- Index

Excerpt: On Christmas Day, 1991, the hammer- and- sickle flag of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics was lowered for the last time over the Kremlin, and Soviet communism passed into history. On that day, the United States of America stood alone, unchallenged, at the pinnacle of global power. A mighty empire had fallen, the first in history to do so without a major war, leaving America in a position of power unique in modern history.

A year later, I stood at the wall of windows in my office on the seventh floor at CIA headquarters looking out at the Virginia countryside. It was cold and overcast. I was reflecting on my imminent retirement, stepping down as director of central intelligence in less than a month, twenty- six years after joining the agency as a rookie analyst working on the Soviet desk. I had lived through the many crises of the last half of the Cold War, never expecting to witness that conflict’s end. On that wintry day in 1992, I thought about all I had seen and done working for six presidents, and wondered about the shape of the world to come. For someone The Washington Post had once characterized as the Eeyore of national security, able to find the darkest cloud in a silver lining, I was uncharacteristically optimistic.

As Bill Clinton raised his right hand to take the oath of office as our forty- second president on January 20, 1993, the United States singularly dominated the world militarily, economically, politically, and culturally— in every dimension of power. Not since the apogee of the Roman Empire had one country been in that position.

A quarter century later, the United States, while still the planet’s most powerful country militarily and economically, is challenged on every front. China is ascending and likely at some point to surpass the United States economically in terms of gross domestic product; Russia, modernizing its military apace, is aggressively threatening and attempting to destabilize Western democracies and dominate its neighbors; North Korea has become a wild- card nuclear power; the Middle East remains a sinkhole of conflict and terrorism. A savage civil war in Syria and the war against the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL) and its “caliphate” brought troops from Russia, Iran, Turkey, and the United States to the battlefield.

After a military intervention led by the United States in 2011, Libya remains divided and engulfed in violence, and Iraq, invaded by the United States in 2003, still strives to create a sustainable, multiethnic government amid the ruins of most of its cities. Iran continues to strengthen its military capabilities, including ballistic missiles, sophisticated drones, cyber threats, and nuclear research, and intensifies its meddling from Lebanon and Syria to Yemen even as it ramps up its contest for religious and regional supremacy with Saudi Arabia. The war in Afghanistan seems endless. Our closest ally, Britain, is leaving the European Union, and authoritarian governments rule our NATO ally Turkey and are rising in Hungary and Poland. The multilateral institutions, alliances, and trade arrangements the United States created in its own self-interest in the decades after World War II have been weakened, in no small part by the very hand that created them, albeit by a president unlike any other. At home, our government is polarized, paralyzed, and seemingly incapable of addressing the manifold problems facing the country.

How did our country go so quickly from unique global power to a country that is widely perceived as no longer willing to bear the costs or accept the responsibility of global leadership—or even capable of governing itself effectively?

Answering how we got to where we are today internationally requires understanding the multiple forms of power that contributed to our achievement of historical singularity, and our earlier leaders' skill in using those many and diverse forms of power along the road to that high point. The answer lies also in the mistakes of post-Cold War presidents and Congresses and, in particular, their failure to recognize, resource, and use the arsenal of nonmilitary assets that proved of critical importance in the long contest with the Soviet Union. It lies as well in their failure to understand that our place in the world in the decades ahead will depend for certain on a strong military but also on reimagining and rebuilding those nonmilitary tools. The answer is, essentially, the failure of too many of our recent political leaders to understand the complexity of American power, both in its expansiveness and in its limitations.

Dwight D. Eisenhower became president on January 20, 1953. During his two terms, the Soviet Union acquired the hydrogen bomb; there were repeated crises with China over Taiwan and the Taiwan Strait; the Joint Chiefs of Staff twice recommended using nuclear weapons—once to help the French at Dien Bien Phu and once against the Chinese; there was a major war in the Middle East involving three of our closest allies (Britain, France, and Israel). There were revolutions in Soviet-dominated East Germany, Poland, and Hungary; a revolution in Cuba; and many lesser crises. The period was one of great tension in the Cold War with the Soviets. And yet, from the moment Eisenhower signed the armistice agreement ending the Korean War in July 1953 until he left office in January 1961, not one American soldier was killed in combat. American prestige stood high around the world. How did he manage that feat?

Eisenhower was the only post-World War II president who was a career military officer, a five-star general who became commander in chief. He brought to the presidency great personal strengths, strategic insight, and leadership skills. He understood the uncertainties and risks always attendant to military operations. He knew the limits of military power in the nuclear age. He had the experience and confidence—and rank—to tell his generals no. Above all, he grasped the importance of diplomacy, economics, communication, and the many other tools of influence. He understood and wielded power in all its dimensions.

Ronald Reagan was routinely underestimated. Yet, as the Soviet Union began to falter internally in the 1980s, Reagan effectively used every instrument of American power to push the Soviets over the edge, from crisis to collapse. Upon taking office, he began the largest American military buildup in decades. He

mobilized the CIA to covertly challenge Soviet adventurism and activities around the world, arming foes of Cuba—which acted as a surrogate for the USSR—in Angola, Ethiopia, and Central America; challenged the Soviets directly in Afghanistan by arming the mujahedin; and supported anticommunist movements such as Solidarity in Poland. Reagan brought economic pressure to bear on the USSR through sanctions and unprecedentedly aggressive efforts to block its acquisition of Western technology and know-how that might assist their weapons programs and their economy. Not since Eisenhower's and Kennedy's time did the United States Information Agency and its many channels of communication have such strong presidential support in sending America's message abroad—a message about the United States and what it stood for, and blunt talk about Soviet tyranny. Reagan also understood the importance of diplomacy and so, in 1984–85, he pivoted, offering an outreached hand to Mikhail Gorbachev. Despite ups and downs, they reached an agreement on eliminating intermediate-range nuclear weapons from Europe and overall dramatically eased tensions. Most important, Reagan's outstretched hand gave Gorbachev the political space at home to continue his reforms, which were destroying the Soviet Union.

There is no precedent in history of a great empire collapsing without a major war. Yet, through extraordinary diplomacy, George H. W. Bush (Bush 41) facilitated the liberation of Eastern Europe and managed to end the Cold War—and the Soviet Union—without violence. He orchestrated the reunification of Germany inside the NATO alliance, assembled a coalition of three dozen countries to reverse Saddam Hussein's aggression against Kuwait, and used that victory to begin a peace process in the Middle East. Building on and broadening what Reagan achieved, through skilled diplomacy and the judicious use of force, Bush 41 brought the United States out of the Cold War to a place of unparalleled dominance in every measure of national power.

Eisenhower, Reagan, and Bush, three presidents with quite different backgrounds, wielded all the instruments of American power with extraordinary skill. This book assesses their post-Cold War successors' decisions in fifteen critical places, the effectiveness of their use of the instruments of American power, and the lessons we must learn for the future.

They are vital lessons because a quarter of a century after the collapse of the USSR a new rival for global influence and power has emerged, one far more formidable in the breadth and scale of its nonmilitary achievements and instruments of power than the Soviet Union. The USSR in its last decades was purely a military peer to the United States. As it degenerated into a paralyzed political gerontocracy and economic shambles, Moscow held little appeal around the world as a model to emulate.

China, by contrast, has a huge and growing economy and in recent decades has lifted hundreds of millions of its people out of poverty. It has built new cities and an enviable modern infrastructure. Its educational and technological achievements—and potential—are daunting. It has undertaken vast new initiatives to build infrastructure in countries throughout Asia, Africa, and the Middle East, and is expanding its economic and trading relationships globally. Xi Jinping, China's leader for life, now touts his country as a model for governance, independence, rapid economic development, and technological achievement—an attractive alternative to the liberal democracies' political dysfunction, economic crises (as in 2008–9), and disparities between rich and poor. China is beset by many difficult problems of its own, but it is also a multidimensional power eager to challenge the United States in every sphere. While both sides continue to build military power, they recognize that a military conflict between them, nuclear or not, would be catastrophic. And so, as in the Cold War with the Soviet Union, this rivalry in the years to come is most likely to play out in the nonmilitary arenas of national power, in which China has been investing and which the United States has neglected since the collapse of the Soviet Union.



Whether the perception, and in some cases the reality, of America pulling back from global leadership can be reversed, whether America will reassert its willingness to bear the mantle of such leadership, whether America has the will and the creativity to cope with China's global ambitions and those of other authoritarian regimes— not to mention other international challenges— depends upon a better understanding of what constitutes American power, how to revitalize it, and how to wield it more effectively.

Throughout history, power has most commonly been defined in terms of the ability to coerce obedience or submission by force of arms. But it is a mistake to think of power only in those terms. Think of the power of patriotism to inspire military service; of ideology and faith to evoke sacrifice; of government to protect the weak and disadvantaged; of a military to provide relief after a natural disaster; of peaceful resistance to oppression. From ancient times, there have been noncoercive, intangible forms of power that have changed history, such as the idea of democracy in Greece; Roman law and broadly offered Roman citizenship to conquered peoples; religion; the concepts that fueled the American and French revolutions; the Napoleonic Code; Marxism; and nationalism.

I argued as secretary of defense that the American government had become too reliant on the use of military power to defend and extend our interests internationally, that the use of force had become a first choice rather than a last resort. It is time to look afresh at the many forms of power available to America (and others as well) and then assess how well— or not— we have done since the end of the Cold War in resourcing, integrating, and using those tools. We can then draw conclusions about our approach to the world now and in the future.

A fundamental question about American power is: To what end do we use it? What are our purposes and goals in the world beyond protecting our own interests, particularly when it comes to advancing freedom and democracy? This question has dominated American foreign policy during the first quarter century after the Cold War, and it has been debated since the first days of the republic. How should we incorporate America's democratic ideals and aspirations into our relations with the rest of the world? When should we try to change the way other nations govern themselves? Should America's mission be to make the world "safe for democracy," as President Woodrow Wilson said, or, in the words of John Quincy Adams, should America be "the well-wisher to freedom and independence of all" but the "champion and vindicator only of her own"? Of our post-Cold War presidents, Bill Clinton and George W. Bush came down on the side of Wilson as interventionists, with long-term consequences for us and the world; Barack Obama tried to play it both ways; and Donald Trump has been all about minding our own business— both literally and figuratively— and being silent about the internal affairs of other countries, especially authoritarian ones. His and Obama's actions, both much closer to Adams's than Wilson's, have also had significant consequences.

Their varied responses demonstrate that once we get beyond broad agreement on protecting the country from foreign threats, the answer to the question of American purposes and goals in the world is not a simple one. But, based on our history and our experience during the Cold War and since, we must define our role and the means to fulfill it in ways that can win broad support in this splintered republic and among its leaders. Drawing on more than fifty years in the national security arena serving eight presidents, I intend to make a stab at it.

There are many studies and books on how the United States has applied its power since 1993 and should apply it in the future. Few of those authors, however, have had power and exercised it; only a handful have been firsthand witnesses to history making, and then nearly always under just one or two

presidents. The authors are mostly foreign policy mavens, historians, and political scientists who write from think tanks, universities, institutes, and other such perches. Only a small number have written about the multiple forms of power usable in international affairs, particularly those beyond the military, diplomatic, and economic spheres.

Leaders who have held power have not written about power per se. They wrote about their own experience, policies they favored or opposed, challenges they faced, and the decisions they made (as well as writing to shape their legacies). This is true of all U.S. presidents in modern times. In their memoirs and other books, they didn't write about power as a concept or about its many different forms. The presidents I worked for just didn't think that way. National Security Advisers Henry Kissinger, Brent Scowcroft, and Zbigniew Brzezinski were world-class geostrategists, but even they didn't write or think about the different forms of power—and none of them paid much attention to economic and financial tools. I know, because I worked for all three. Nor did various secretaries of state and defense in their memoirs address the wide range of instruments of power available to them. The leaders who came closest to a comprehensive approach to power were probably Secretaries of State Dean Acheson and George Shultz, but even those two tended to view the various forms of power in relation to specific situations and not as part of the universe of instruments of power beyond military, diplomatic, and economic leverage. Historical figures writing about power, such as Machiavelli, focus primarily on how to get it and how to keep it.

I believe that each of the fifteen significant post-Cold War challenges I will examine in the pages to follow must be addressed in its own narrative as it has evolved over time. This will provide the continuity—the story line—essential to understanding the response by successive presidents, and why those challenges remain before us in every instance. Accordingly, I address the challenges separately and roughly chronologically, dating from when each first confronted post-Cold War American leaders. I will also deal with the reality that all the presidents had to confront many of these problems simultaneously and that, routinely, each problem impacted and influenced U.S. decisions on other problems—a sort of three-dimensional chess.

There are, finally, the diverse personalities and decision-making styles of presidents. I served as deputy director (and acting director) of central intelligence for Reagan and deputy national security adviser and director of central intelligence for Bush 41, the last two Cold War presidents. I was secretary of defense for two of the four post-Cold War presidents. I worked on the National Security Council staff for three other presidents, spending three years working just down the hall from the Oval Office for one of those. I witnessed and participated in decision making under more presidents of both parties than any other contemporary senior official. And so a critical component of this book is my effort to explain how and why presidents made the decisions they did, who most influenced them, and the style unique to each.

There have been U.S. successes in the international arena during the past quarter century, but the overall trend for us in the global arena has been negative, despite our braggadocio. To deal with the diverse challenges America faces, America must lead. But to lead, to achieve its purposes and goals, it must strengthen all the instruments of power and apply them with greater wisdom. We must use the American symphony of power to ensure that authoritarianism, twice defeated in the twentieth century, does not prevail in the twenty-first. <>

## SHAKESPEARE AND PROTESTANT POETICS by Jason Gleckman [Palgrave Macmillan, 9789813295988]

This book explores the impact of the sixteenth-century Reformation on the plays of William Shakespeare. Taking three fundamental Protestant concerns of the era – (double) predestination, conversion, and free will – it demonstrates how Protestant theologians, in England and elsewhere, re-imagined these longstanding Christian concepts from a specifically Protestant perspective. Shakespeare utilizes these insights to generate his distinctive view of human nature and the relationship between humans and God. Through in-depth readings of the Shakespeare comedies ‘The Merry Wives of Windsor’, ‘Much Ado About Nothing’, ‘A Midsummer Night’s Dream’, and ‘Twelfth Night’, the romance ‘A Winter’s Tale’, and the tragedies of ‘Macbeth’ and ‘Hamlet’, this book examines the results of almost a century of Protestant thought upon literary art.

### CONTENTS

#### I Introduction

#### Section I Predestination

#### 2 Predestination, Single and Double in Christian History

##### Predestination as Foreknowledge

##### Single Predestination Thought

##### Double Predestination Thought Before the Reformation

##### Why Double Predestination Thought Was Not Often Upheld:

##### God as the Author of Sin

#### 3 The Reformation and the Revival of Double Predestination Thought

##### Martin Luther

##### Later Reformers

##### Reluctance on the Part of Protestants to Accept Double Predestination Thinking

##### Debates on Single and Double Predestination Thinking in Sixteenth-Century England

#### 4 Double Predestination in Early English Drama Double Predestination in Medieval

##### ‘Mystery’ Plays Double Predestination in Early Modern English Drama

#### 5 Double Predestination in Shakespearean Comedy and Tragedy:

##### The Merry Wives of Windsor and Macbeth ‘God Is the Author of Sin’: The Merry Wives of Windsor

##### The Elect and the Reprobate in Shakespeare

##### Being “King Hereafter” and Macbeth

##### ‘Imputed Righteousness’ in Macbeth

#### 6 Double Predestination and Assurance in Shakespeare:

##### Macbeth and Twelfth Night

##### Protestant ‘Assurance’

##### Assurance in Macbeth

##### Assurance in Twelfth Night

#### Section II Conversion

#### 7 Conversion in Protestant and Catholic Thought in the Reformation

##### What Is a Religious ‘Conversion’?

##### Early Modern Conversions into Catholicism and Protestantism

##### The Body in Conversion

##### The Body in Early Modern Catholic and Protestant Conversions

#### 8 The Protestant Conversion into Marriage

##### Christian Celibacy

##### Protestant Views of Marriage and Celibacy

The Nature of Early Modern Protestant Marriage

9 The Shakespearean Conversion Paradigm: Much Ado About Nothing

Religious and Erotic Conversions in Spenser and Shakespeare

Celibacy and Erotic Conversion in Much Ado About Nothing 'Love at First Sight' and

Conversion of the 'Heart of Stone'

The Role of Reason in Conversion

Lapsing from the Converted State

The Conversion Experience in Summary

Erotic Conversion and the Contours of the Protestant Church

10 English Protestant Conversion in A Midsummer Night's Dream

A Brief History of Eroticism

Conversion and the (Female) Body

The Power of Eros in Spenser and Shakespeare

Divine Lust

The (Erotic) Process of De-conversion and Apostasy

11 Apostasy in The Winter's Tale

Married Life

Marriage and Friendship

The Tragedy of Rejecting Marriage

Section III Free Will

12 The Three Components of Free Will in Plato and Aristotle: Thumos, Reason, and

Deliberative Reason

The Components of the Will

Thumos

Reason

Deliberative Reason

13 The Free Will in Augustine, the Middle Ages, and the Reformation

Freedom

Earlier and Later Augustine on the Freedom of the Will Thirteenth-Century Conceptions of the

Free Will Reformation Conceptions of the Free Will

14 Free Will and Free Conscience in Hamlet

Free Will

The Conscience and the Free Will

Casuistry and the Free Will

Synteresis, Natural Law, and the Free Will

Can One Have a Conscience Without Synteresis?

The Unregenerate Conscience as an Evil Conscience

The Regenerated Conscience

Returning to the Synteresis

15 Hamlet and the Free Will in Action

Preparing to Use the Will

Exerting the Free Will

The Free Will and Theatrical Catharsis

16 The Player's Speech

The Player's Speech

Conclusion

Bibliography

Index

This study of Protestant ideas in Shakespeare's plays begins with two controversial premises about the sixteenth-century Protestant Reformation. The first is that, in relation to Europe, at least in terms of theology, the Reformation can be viewed as a single intellectual movement encompassing both German Lutheran thought and that of the Reformed Churches, particularly those in Switzerland, but also in France, Scotland, the Netherlands, and, for the purposes of this book, England. All these theologies, as I see them, defined themselves in opposition to the Roman Catholic Church to a much greater extent than they saw themselves in conflict with each other. The second premise relates to the history of sixteenth-century England and offers a similar argument, that from an early stage of the Reformation, there were those who, like Martin Luther (1483–1546), strongly criticized the Roman Catholic Church not, as English Catholics did, on the basis of its domination by a foreign power or its unwillingness to promote the vernacular Bible or even because of the corruption of some of its clergy, but rather because the Church's theology could not accommodate the new ideas that Luther had brought into Christian thinking. These ideas, largely inspired by Luther's readings of the late, anti-Pelagian works of Augustine (354–430), affected the ways in which people viewed themselves (as utterly sinful), their relationship to God (as entirely helpless), and their purpose in life (fulfilling a calling in the world and rejecting the monastic life as an ideal). The concept of double predestination, which Luther introduced, at least to an extent, into Protestantism, could not be accommodated by previous Christian thinking and therefore could not be assimilated into the theology of sixteenth-century Roman Catholicism.

In addition to arguing for this agenda, this book aims to show the effects of these revolutionary Protestant ideas on William Shakespeare, a writer who read his Bible, was aware of Christian history, and who, I argue, was fascinated by the transformations in human psychology implied by the Reformation. Rather than asking themselves how they could be saved, Protestants tended to ask how they could know they were already saved. Rather than seeing the process of justification (God's bestowal of grace upon the elect) in the usual Christian way, derived from Augustine, as inseparable from the ensuing process of sanctification or regeneration, Protestants distinguished the two, creating a sense that justification was applied by God in a forensic manner, saving a person with no regard for his or her good 'works.' This meant, in effect, that elect humans were seen as bifurcated, to use Luther's terms, simultaneously justified and sinful (*simul iuste et peccator*); they led their lives attempting to be sanctified but, at every moment (or at least, as I will argue, during some rare privileged moments), they led a parallel life in the company of God. This life was referred to as the life of faith, and the connection between the two lives is such an abstract concept that it required creative artists, such as Shakespeare, to convey.

Before exploring in more detail the nature of these Protestant innovations and their effects on literary history, it must be noted that neither of the positions stated in the first paragraph of this Introduction are mainstream views; indeed, much can be said against them. There can be no doubt, for instance, that relations between the Reformed and Lutheran Churches became increasingly tense as the sixteenth century continued; this was largely due to Luther's intransigence as an individual, but there were many other factors. The most significant of these, historians concur, related to the Eucharist. Lutherans believed in the real presence of Christ in the mass, even utilizing, as Diarmaid MacCulloch notes, "the elevation of the host" as part of the ceremony, which would have been seen by Reformers as distressingly close to Catholic practice. In contrast, the Reformed position, often termed 'sacramentarian,' viewed the Eucharist as a symbolic or spiritual or memorial participation in Christ's Last Supper. This issue, historians concur, was at the root of Lutheran and Reformed division, and I would suggest it was also the primary trait distinguishing the two groups. This huge fissure occurred, moreover, early in the Reformation; at the Colloquy of Marburg in 1529, Luther and (Huldrych/ Ulrich)

Zwingli (1484–1531), the father of the Reformation in Zurich, agreed on 14 points of doctrine, but could not agree on this one, and supposedly Luther would not shake Zwingli's hand.

Over the centuries, numerous additional qualities beyond the issue of the mass have been proposed to further distinguish sixteenth-century Lutheran theology from Reformed. One of the most significant boundary markers is the use of images in the church, which Reformers aggressively opposed but Lutherans considered *adiaphora*, or an optional element of worship. This distaste of images, it is often argued, leads to a second distinction between the theology of the Reformers and the Lutherans, namely, the greater austerity often attributed to the former. This is seen in relation to the practices of worship, wherein the Reformed were more determined than Lutherans to rid their services of what were termed Catholic excesses and adhere more closely to what was considered Biblical guidance. Such austerity is also seen, for example, in relation to later Puritanism in England, to indicate an 'austerity' of lifestyle in contrast to a supposedly more sensuous Lutheranism. A third, often cited, distinction between Lutheran and Reformed theology is the greater emphasis placed by the latter upon the law. It is sometimes argued that Luther distinguished law from gospel more severely than did the Reformers, presenting obedience to the law as a crucial sign of a good person but nonetheless a form of works or civic righteousness only, and not relevant to the spiritual relationship between God and humans. In contrast, it is argued that the Reformed theologians worked harder to introduce law into the church—structuring the Church in line with Biblical directives, disciplining members of congregations, elucidating in more detail the proper relationships between Church and State, and generally feeling more comfortable in relation to the law than Luther did. For example, David C. Fink has suggested that, over the course of the sixteenth-century Reformation, the idea of the imputation of righteousness in the elect was gradually added to the initial Lutheran premise that election meant the non-imputation of sin. This later view (evident, as Fink points out, in "The Second Helvetic Confession" of 1566) would provide additional confidence to Protestants that, armed with Christ's righteousness, they could more fully comply with the law.

The belief that the Reformation and Lutheran components of sixteenth-century Protestantism are usefully separated is a frequently presented one. Philip Benedict's extensive and careful survey of sixteenth-century European religion, *Christ's Churches Purely Reformed*, assumes that the two Churches can be easily distinguished. The book opens with the assertion that "Although Martin Luther towered over the initial decades of the Reformation, Calvinism superseded Lutheranism within a generation as the most dynamic and widely established form of European Protestantism." But I would argue that, with the exception of the mass, none of the points noted above mark a sufficiently strong theological dividing line between Lutheran and Reformed. Lutherans certainly did not think their tolerance of imagery turned them into Protestants. At the Colloquy of Montbéliard in 1586, when arguing about iconoclasm with Theodor Beza (1519–1605), the Lutheran theologian Jakob Andreae (1528–1590) said that, despite the presence of images in Lutheran Churches, Lutherans were not prone to the "horrors, superstitions and idolatry" of Catholicism. A commitment to austerity is even less useful as a dividing line between Lutheran and Reformed thinking. In the sixteenth century, many upstanding members of the Church of England considered themselves Protestant and yet felt comfortable with the liturgical practices of their Church in opposition to more severe Continental approaches. They did not consider themselves to be Lutherans, which shows that a reluctance to embrace austerity as a Church principle cannot be restricted to Lutheran thought. The same, by the way, would be true for the matter of Church discipline which many fully Protestant English people opposed despite its prevalence in the Swiss Reformed Churches. When it came to the law, Lutherans also valued it and had strong views on the nature of the proper relationship between pastors and the

communities they served. Lutherans also wrote about the law; it was the Lutheran Philip Melanchthon (1497–1560) who developed the ‘third use of the law’ as a way to further integrate spiritual and civic life.

If the central issue of the sacrament of the Eucharist is put aside, a review of sixteenth-century confessional statements shows great similarities between Reformed and Lutheran approaches, in tone as well as content. David C. Fink has suggested, following Ernst Walter Zeeden, that “each confessional church quickly came to view itself as a universal *confessio catholica*, vested with divine authority as the exclusive mouthpiece of revealed truth.”<sup>11</sup> But this is misleading; sixteenth-century Protestant confessions were largely written to show the close affinities between these Churches and the ways they could build upon each other’s achievements in further consolidating, fine-tuning, and developing the essential Protestant worldview. For example, the French Confession of Faith of 1559 (*Confessio Gallica*) included material on how the ‘natural law’ was an important way for Protestants to perceive God. However, I fully concur with Fink’s approach to studying the Reformation by examining the various Reformed Confessions of the sixteenth century. Fink concludes from such a review that “a remarkable convergence appears between the Lutheran and Reformed confessions ... a convergence centering on a two-stage model of justification in sharp distinction from regeneration.”

This was not the only issue that joined Lutherans and Reformers, theologically. Both groups aggressively rejected both the practices of the Roman Catholic Church and its view of Church history as a legitimately apostolic succession. Both groups insisted on the Bible as the sole means of determining religious truth, and both stressed the extent to which human sin had incapacitated humans, making them incapable of even beginning the work of salvation without divine aid. Luther had praised the Reformed “First Helvetic Confession of 1536,” and John Calvin (1509–1564) supported the 1540 *Variata* of the 1530 Augsburg Confession (composed by Melanchthon, among other reasons, to allow sufficient ambiguity in relationship to the real presence in the mass).

We can look at the culminating document of sixteenth-century Lutheran thought, the 1577 “Formula of Concord” and the huge Book of Concord of which it was part, as an example to show the large degree of theological overlap between Lutherans and Reformed. Although the “Formula” was opposed by Reformed churches (including in England) as well as by some Lutherans, it still reads very much like a Reformed Confession. Its “Summary Epitome” refers to original sin not as “a slight corruption in human nature” but as one so “deep that there is nothing sound or uncorrupted left in the human body or soul.” The power of the free will to turn to God is disallowed, rejecting the beliefs of the ‘Pactum’ theologians who had preceded Luther and whose views form much of the basis of the humanist Christianity of Desiderius Erasmus (1466–1536). The Pactum motto ‘the Lord helps those who help themselves’ and all its variants such as “God draws, but he draws those who are willing” were explicitly rejected.<sup>19</sup> The ‘Epitome’ also rejected the blurring of justification with sanctification and privileged the former, implicitly endorsing Luther’s theory regarding the forensic imputation of righteousness. It is true that the “Formula of Concord” strongly rejected the idea of ‘limited atonement’ (primarily on pastoral grounds) and it used language of single rather than double predestination. But the Reformers too (as we shall see in Section I of this book, and including Calvin and Beza) were likewise reluctant to use a fully double predestination terminology. In short, the Lutheran “Formula of Concord” reads much like a Reformed Confession such as those from Geneva or France; the Articles of the Church of England expressed similar views. All of this suggests the contiguity of Lutheran and Reformed theology during the later sixteenth century, in vigorous opposition to Roman Catholicism.

A reader might, at this point, question why relationships between sixteenth-century Lutherans and Reformers are relevant in investigating Protestant thought in Shakespeare. The answer I would give is that if Elizabethan England is seen as a society that rejected Lutheran ideas in favor of Protestant ones, certain significant Lutheran contributions to English Protestant thought might be overlooked or marginalized. For example, the 'Reformed' strand of English Protestantism (associated with Switzerland—Zwingli, Calvin, and Beza) might have been seen, in Shakespeare's time, to have especially contributed to artists exploring such topics as the role of magistrates and the nature of idols. But the Lutheran perspective would also have generated its own foci, many of which relate to Luther's role as probably the earliest, and certainly the most high-profile, proponent of Protestant ideas.

This was the view promoted by the very influential work of John Foxe (1516/17–1587) in his *Acts and Monuments* (first printing 1563); to Foxe, Luther was the person who led Europe out of the dark ages of Roman Catholicism and into a greater communion with the spirit of the primitive church, a spirit that joined all Protestant churches and also promised great things for England's Protestant future. In addition to his role as a spokesperson, there was also the sense of Luther as the first person to 'convert' into the new Protestant faith. This last point is muted in Foxe since he, like other Reformers, wanted to stress how Protestants felt themselves to be returning to the sources of Christian doctrine in the Bible (in a manner akin to the Erasmian humanist goal of 'ad fontes') rather than promoting new doctrine. But the publication of Luther material (by a printer associated with Foxe) in the late 1570s provided commentary (possibly written by Foxe) comparing Luther to Saint Paul; as James Kearney summarizes, this text "suggests that Luther's battle with the text of Romans forces him to his bed without food, drink, or sleep, for three days and three nights" in a manner echoing Saul's conversion in Acts 9. The idea Luther generated following his supposed conversion experience was 'justification by faith,' the sort of terse and dramatic phrase that could launch a revolution.

And while this revolutionary component of Luther was at times understated in Foxe, it was central to how sixteenth-century Catholics saw Luther. They denied Foxe's Protestant narrative that there was a 'true church,' hidden by centuries of misguidance and waiting to be uncovered; instead they argued that Luther had invented the Reformation. "Who are they" asked Thomas Harding (1516–1572) of Bishop John Jewel (1522–1571), another proponent of Foxe's belief in the 'true church'— "What are their names? When or where lived they? ... he can name none before Luther." It is this view of the Protestant as a lone visionary fighting a battle against conventional Christian thinking, that might be lost if scholars approach late sixteenth-century Protestantism, in England, for example, as a religious belief system that was disinterested in its Lutheran roots.

It is in this context that the Elizabethan rejection of Lutheranism needs to be considered. For example, in assessing the influence of Lutheranism in England during this time, Basil Hall writes that, there were "few Lutherans ... and not much interest on the part of the English in the nature of worship in the Lutheran churches"; he continues, "it would be difficult to find an Elizabethan writer approving of Lutheran teaching and methods of worship and advocating them apart from those subjects which had become common to Protestants." Carl A. Trueman similarly notes that while Calvin's *Institutes* and Bullinger's *Decades* were both very popular in England during the reign of Elizabeth, Luther "functioned increasingly as little more than a nostalgic symbol, with his writings having little significance and then mainly with the more moderate Anglicans such as Lancelot Andrewes." I would read these statements as evidence not of the irrelevance of Lutheranism to the spiritual life of English Protestants, but of the extent to which Lutheranism had penetrated into the Elizabethan consciousness; there was less need for English people to read Luther's writings since works such as Bullinger's *Decades* and Calvin's *Institutes* were already heavily influenced by Luther's thinking, used his terminology, and furthered his efforts to



distinguish Protestant modes of thinking from Catholicism. From this perspective, the aim of writers such as Bullinger and Calvin would be to refine, not replace, the insights of Luther. And from the perspective of a literary artist such as Shakespeare, imagining this continuity of Protestant thought, starting from Luther and marking a sharp break with pre-Reformation Catholic authority, could provide a useful context for exploring the nature of religious change over the course of the sixteenth century, as England moved from a Catholic to a Protestant nation.

In turning to the history of early modern England, here too my approach, aiming to integrate Reformed and Lutheran theology and distinguishing this Protestant approach from a Catholic one, seems to be a difficult position to argue. Lucy E.C. Wooding has shown that, given certain definitions of the Reformation, it is not possible to distinguish early modern English Catholicism and Protestantism from one another. As Wooding writes, in the first half of the sixteenth century in England, people may have used these two terms to describe their faith, but the words cannot yet be associated with a “distinct set of beliefs.” Instead, the era was characterized by a “single reformist impulse” that, inspired by Erasmian humanism, strove for such aims as using the vernacular as a mode of teaching Christianity, reading and disseminating the Bible more widely, reforming the clergy (perhaps more along the lines of the primitive church), and reducing the influence of the Papacy in England. Wooding suggests that the term “evangelical” is an appropriate one to describe this group of reformers.

Yet it might be possible to argue for a different reading of the first decades of the sixteenth century if alternative qualities of Protestantism are emphasized. If concepts such as double presentation, forensic justification, and the pervasiveness of human sin are seen as the key components of Protestant thought, earlier distinctions between Protestants and Catholics might be more articulable. For example, although Wooding does not consider Thomas More (1478–1535) to be a typical Catholic in his extreme reactions to Luther, More’s 1530 *A Dialogue Concerning Heresies* certainly identifies some key elements of Luther’s thinking that were completely at odds with Christian thought as he knew it. More identifies some of Luther’s most challenging ideas: “it is sacrilege to go about to please God with any works,” “the good and righteous man always sinneth in doing well,” “no man hath free will,” and that “God is as verily the author and cause of the evil will of Judas ... as of the good will of Christ.” In his criticisms, More recognized that Luther, deriving many of his views from late Augustine, believed that the works of people who lack prevenient grace are completely sinful, that humans have no input into determining their spiritual status, and even that God is the ‘author of sin,’ a premise even Protestants found it challenging to accept.

Whatever the precise contours of the earliest English Protestant beliefs might be, Wooding and other concur that, by the middle of the century, distinctions between Protestant and Catholic theology were quite visible, a trend exacerbated by the relatively aggressive anti-Protestant conclusions reached at the Catholic Council of Trent (1545–1563). In terms of England, Alister McGrath writes that “the first clear and unambiguous statement of the concept of the imputation of righteousness” in English is to be found in the writings of the Lutheran Robert Barnes (c. 1495–1540) in 1534. But more studies could be done to determine the ways in which early Protestant thought moved closer to Augustine and away from Erasmus in the wake of Luther and other early reformation writers. For example, Carl Trueman cites a passage from *An Answer to Sir Thomas More’s Dialogue* (1531) written by William Tyndale (c. 1494–1536), where Tyndale writes “faith justifieth in the heart and before God; and the deeds before the world only, and maketh the other seen.” In Trueman’s reading, Tyndale either rejected or did not yet comprehend the Lutheran idea of separating justification from sanctification rather than, in the earlier Augustinian approach, blurring the two; Trueman writes “It is clear from this passage that Tyndale is not referring to true double justification but is emphasizing that works are derived from, and declare before

the world, the prior justification of the sinner by faith before God.” Yet Tyndale’s language pits “heart and before God” against the “world only” rather than seeing them (as in the earlier Christian model) as part of a single process of being saved and then demonstrating it.

By the time of Shakespeare, a strong Protestant–Catholic divide surely existed; it is no exaggeration to say that, after Regnans in Excelsis, the papal bull of 1570 which excommunicated Elizabeth, and the St. Bartholomew Day’s Massacre of 1572, it was unsafe to be a Catholic in England. This state of affairs reflects the developments I have outlined so far, the growing sense of a distinctively Protestant England with close ties to other reformed territories, theologically constructed out of ideas originating in Luther and developed by other reformers, and very anti- Catholic. As we have seen, John Foxe and John Jewel were largely responsible for this development in their theorization of a ‘true church’ that bypassed the Roman Catholic one. Wooding has written that “the Catholic and Protestant traditions existed side by side in England through the formative years of Reformation, and to see them as polarities in a single conflict is to parody their relationship.” Yet, in this case, the parodic narrative apparently became the accepted one— with Luther, as Foxe put it, being the “principal organ and minister” of the new Protestant age, and (starting in the second, 1570, edition of Foxe’s work), William Tyndale (c. 1494–1536) labeled as the first “Apostle of England”—implying he was the first significant English disciple of Luther.

I don’t believe Shakespeare would have fully endorsed all elements of Foxe’s Protestant vision. Shakespeare did not seem to have shared Foxe’s abhorrence of the Roman Catholic Church or Foxe’s analogies of persecutions in the Marian regime to those of Christians during the Roman Empire; even Foxe himself might have lacked confidence in the optimistic idea that Elizabeth was sent to England by God to further the cause of international Protestantism. But I believe Shakespeare shared Foxe’s sense that Protestantism was a distinctive faith—even despite assertions of its antiquity, a revolutionary one—and the purpose of this book is to articulate some of the ways in which that was so.

Alister McGrath takes a useful stance in relation to such a project. In his important work, *Iustitia Dei*, McGrath suggests that the Lutheran conflux of terms *simul iustus et peccator*, the imputation of righteousness (alien righteousness), and forensic justification (in contrast to the ensuing sanctification or regeneration) are a crucial entryway into Protestant thought. All of these phrases (which did not develop all at once) convey the view of Luther that humans are not to be thought of as a combination of good and evil impulses striving for supremacy, but as creatures who, if they are fortunate, are simultaneously good and evil all of the time. From the human point of view, humans can only commit sins and therefore merit the punishments they receive. But from the divine perspective, some people are different; they are the elect and are simultaneously sinful and saved. The sense that a person could have two distinct identities was eventually developed by Luther into a sense of the justified self almost at odds with the sanctified one; the justified component of the self was saved repeatedly, at every given moment when an elect person’s heart was filled with faith for God. The sanctified component of the self lived more in a temporal manner, going through life doing good deeds to honor God. As Luther stresses, such good deeds were valuable but only part of the human world and not as closely tied to God whose incredible power appeared primarily in justification of the elect despite their sin.

In this book I take a somewhat different starting point from that of McGrath, and begin with an examination of double predestination thinking. Clearly, the question of whether one would go to heaven or hell or purgatory following death would be a crucial one in a Christian culture where God is felt to punish sin and reward virtue. In prior Christian thinking, as will be seen in the first section of this book, God generally was seen to determine one’s fate based on one’s deeds in life. Augustine, in his late

works, had argued for an alternative view that was more difficult to assimilate: that human deeds were not the origin of human virtue and that virtue originated in the divine spark of prevenient grace. For Protestants, however, a new possibility, only rarely seen in previous Christian history, of double predestination, began to emerge, along with a large number of challenging consequences for those who maintained this belief. While it had the advantage of fitting in beautifully with one of Protestantism's priorities, namely stressing the total power of God over creation, God's use of that power to determine all individual human fates as either elect or reprobate (there was no purgatory) was potentially terrifying. It was a situation made even worse by the fact that God made this choice before the world began (or after the Fall) and there was no petitioning for a review. If it were possible to make the situation more tense, a belief in double predestination thinking also challenged Protestant's views of their own God. For if people were damned before they sinned, it was very difficult to avoid concluding that God was the 'author of sin,' a view no Christian, Protestant or Catholic, would hold in the sixteenth century. There was at least one possible way out of this dilemma, which was to assume that sin was not the cause of reprobation, a position that led to the further stance that there was no meaningful difference, in actions and even in thoughts, between the nature of the reprobate and the elect; both categories of people sin all the time and with equal intensity. What then distinguishes elect from reprobate? And how is God to be acquitted of the accusation of being the author of sin?

\*\*\*

Clearly working out such ideas would not be easy. In a fascinating passage from his "On the Bondage of the Will" ("De Servo Arbitrio") (1525), wherein Luther first explored the implications of double predestination thinking, he pleaded with his humanist opponents to help him discern the workings of a God who must be totally good but who nonetheless damns people to hell before they are born: "But if God pleases you when he crowns the unworthy [i.e., in single predestination thinking], he ought not to displease you when he damns the undeserving. If he is just in the former case, why not in the latter?" Discerning the mercy and justice within the law was a lifetime Lutheran project; he began his career thinking that the law (and all its manifestations, such as conscience) were a torment to humans and needed to be transcended. But Luther later developed ideas, as did other Protestants, about how the law, since it emerges from God, must be good, even as it condemns people yet unborn to hell.

In the first section of this book, after outlining the idea of double predestination thinking as it appeared sporadically throughout Christian history, I discuss its appearance as one of the foundational revolutionary principles of Protestantism in the writings of Luther, Calvin, and other reformers. I then show the first appearances of this doctrine in English medieval drama, and demonstrate its significance in later plays such as *The Conflict of Conscience* (1581) by Nathaniel Woodes (c. 1550-after 1594), and *Doctor Faustus* (c. 1588–1592) by Christopher Marlowe (1564–1593). The final section chapters show how Shakespeare utilized the idea of double predestination both in relation to tragedy, where it propels *Macbeth* into musing on the nature of both fate and sin, and also in comedy, where, in *The Merry Wives of Windsor*, Shakespeare cleverly demonstrates how making God the author of sin is not necessarily a bad thing for humans. This section concludes with a discussion of the comedy *Twelfth Night* to show Shakespeare's reaction to the development of a specifically 'hot Protestant' or Puritan idea, that of attaining 'assurance' in one's elected status, as demonstrated by Malvolio.

The second section of this book explores what it would have meant, in the sixteenth century, to convert into a Protestant belief system in contrast to a Catholic one. This meant adopting a set of doctrines, for instance a complex of ideas emanating from the principles of double predestination, forensic justification, and prevenient grace (i.e. faith); yet such conversion also involved, I will argue,

having a different sense of one's body than Christians had possessed in the past. For Protestants, the converted body found its purpose not in becoming purified or consecrated but rather by submitting to the irresistible desires of the flesh through marriage. One of the most immediately visible effects of the first years of the Reformation was the large number of clerical marriages; and this section of this book argues that such marriages signified an entry into the specifically Protestant way of life—a calling as it were. Moreover, this was a calling that, in the hands of artists such as Spenser and Shakespeare, that ennobled the faculty of physical lust to an extent that most Protestants would not have accepted, but which occurs in a manner appropriate to the Protestant worldview. In Shakespeare's comedies, *Much Ado About Nothing*, *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, and in the tragedy *A Winter's Tale*, as well as in Spenser's *The Faerie Queene*, we can see the role played by physical passion in generating religious conversion to the Protestant faith.

The final section of this book is about free will, a topic that predates Christianity and involves reconstructing the history of the issue by looking at Plato's and Aristotle's views, views utilized by later Christian thinkers, especially in the thirteenth century when 'free will' became a high-profile topic. Indeed the 'free will' was, arguably, one of the few topics appearing in the New Testament whose development could be traced more to classical Greek traditions than Old Testament ones. This circumstance provided Renaissance thinkers with an opportunity to use the concept as a bridge between Christian and non-Christian cultures and consequently to imagine how God operated in such 'natural law' environments. Moreover, since many Protestants (such as Luther) believed that when the spirit of faith was not actually operative, there was, in effect, no difference between the elect and the non-elect. This placed most elect Christians, most of the time, in the ranks of reprobates, Catholics, and pagans. These groups of people had to rely on their own free will to make wise and ethical choices; they were armed with centuries of advice and in possession of a will that, even as early as Augustine, had incorporated the qualities of strength, freedom, reason, and conscience. Nonetheless, Protestants believed that this free will could only produce sin; this belief was an explicit rejection of the Erasmian humanist approach to free will based on the 'pactum theology' principles of late medieval nominalism (the *via moderna*). In *Hamlet*, the focus of this book's final chapters, we can see this fallen free will in action—for even as Hamlet prays for a regenerated will, one that will be filled with faith and act instinctively on behalf of God, he finds himself in a more tragic world where those prayers are not readily answered. In the end, Hamlet asks its audience to imagine how the Protestant God functions, and how this God can turn inevitable human sin into something properly deserving of the term 'elect.'

In all three sections of this book, the goal is threefold: to identify a clear element of Protestant thinking, unshared by Catholics, to explain its history in Christian thinking, and to show how Shakespeare, as an artist, utilized the given idea in his plays in order to generate his distinctive views of human nature and its relationship with the divine. <>

**EXPLAINING THE COSMOS: CREATION AND CULTURAL INTERACTION IN LATE-ANTIQUE GAZA** by Michael W. Champion [Oxford Studies in Late Antiquity, Oxford University Press, 9780199337484]

**EXPLAINING THE COSMOS: CREATION AND CULTURAL INTERACTION IN LATE-ANTIQUE GAZA** analyzes the writings of three thinkers associated with Gaza: Aeneas, Zacharias and Procopius. Together, they offer a case study for the appropriation, adaptation, and transformation of classical

philosophy in late antiquity, and for cultural transitions more generally in Gaza. Aeneas claimed that the "Academy and Lyceum" had been transferred to Gaza. This book asks what the cultural and intellectual characteristics of the Gazan "Academies" were, and how members of the schools mixed with local cultures of Christians, philosophers, rhetoricians and monks from the local monasteries.

Aeneas, Zacharias and Procopius each contributed to debates about the creation and eternity of the world, which ran from the Neoplatonist Proclus into the sixth-century disputes between Philoponus, Simplicius and Cosmas Indicopleustes. The Gazan contribution is significant in its own right, highlighting distinctive aspects of late-antique Christianity, and it throws the later philosophical debates into sharper relief. Focusing on the creation debates also allows for exploration of the local cultures that constituted Gazan society in the late-fifth and early-sixth centuries. *Explaining the Cosmos* further explores cultural dynamics in the Gazan schools and monasteries and the wider cultural history of the city. The Gazans adapt and transform aspects of Classical and Neoplatonic culture while rejecting Neoplatonic religious claims. The study also analyses the Gazans' intellectual contributions in the context of Neoplatonism and early Christianity. The Gaza which emerges from this study is a set of cultures in transition, mutually constituting and transforming each other through a fugal pattern of exchange, adaptation, conflict and collaboration.

- Contents
- Preface
- Abbreviations
- 1 Introduction
- Part I Creating Gazan Cultures
- 2 Late-Antique Gaza
- 3 Gazan Culture Performed and Transformed by Aeneas, Zacharias, and Procopius
- Part II Explaining Creation
- 4 Christian and Neoplatonic Creations
- 5 Procopius on Creation and Eternity
- 6 Aeneas and Zacharias on Creation and Eternity
- 7 Conclusion
- Bibliography
- Index Locorum
- General Index

Excerpt: In one of his letters, Aeneas of Gaza claimed that 'the Academy and the Lyceum are among us'. Three thinkers associated with Gaza—Aeneas, Procopius, and Zacharias—provide a case study for the appropriation, adaptation, and transformation of classical philosophy in Christian late antiquity, as well as for cultural transitions more generally in the city. The three Gazans mix in a range of social groups in the city and beyond and are interesting for the history of ideas in their own right, for the reception of Neoplatonic ideas, especially those of Proclus, and for the light they cast on later debates between thinkers such as Philoponus and Simplicius.

Aeneas' dialogue and that of Zacharias is self-consciously Platonic and both thinkers, along with Procopius in his *Commentary on Genesis*, respond to the contemporary Neoplatonic claim, put cogently by Proclus in the fifth century, that the world is eternal. This would undermine the Christian belief that God will ultimately bring in a new creation and make the cosmos perfect. The Gazans do not match the philosophical sophistication of Philoponus, although they do on occasions offer arguments that might give Neoplatonists pause for thought. Their arguments are more often governed by Christian problems,

and they set out a version of the divine plan of salvation that moves their thought from physics to ethics and on to soteriology. Analysis of the dialogues simultaneously yields rich information about the cultural dynamics of the Gazan schools, on relationships between Christians and Neoplatonists in the schools, and on interactions between the schools and local monasteries. The book therefore maps the local cultures that constituted educated elite society in Gaza. My emphasis on local cultures aims to counteract the tendency to talk of Christianity as a unified monolith and goes beyond approaches which pluralize Christianity in terms of different doctrinal readings or 'heresies'. It also provides a model of cultural groups as heterogeneous and open, moving away from paradigms of cultural analysis that privilege conflict in explaining cultural identity formation.

Throughout, my aim is that intellectual history will support cultural analysis and exploration of power dynamics, and that cultural problems encoded in their texts will help to situate the Gazans' ideas. As such, the book is an attempt to bring intellectual and cultural history closely together. The book is inherently interdisciplinary. Scholars of early Christianity will recognize many of the Christian arguments, scholars of ancient philosophy will recall the main outline of the Neoplatonic debates, and scholars of late-antique history will find familiar cultural traces left by the texts, although the Gazans provide surprises in all these areas. Putting these different disciplines in closer dialogue with each other is intended to enrich each...

The three Gazans are introduced along with their respective works, after considering how the method of elucidation of problems may unite cultural and intellectual history, how culture may best be conceptualized, and the applicability of the term 'Gazan' to three thinkers with different associations with the city. The concept of 'local culture' is introduced. The chapter then discusses Aeneas' letters and his dialogue the *Theophrastus*; Zacharias' histories, polemic works, and his *Ammonius*; and Procopius' biblical and philosophical interests (his *Commentary on Genesis* and the *Refutatio Procli*, including problems with dating and authenticity).

*EUXITHEUS ...Come, tell me, do you still have people among you who display the mysteries of philosophy, as Hierocles, our teacher, did? And do fine and noble young men, such as my contemporary Protagoras the Lycian, who was pre-eminent in virtue and character, still attend a school?*

*EGYPTUS There were noble things long ago, but now they have departed and are destroyed. This man does not want to learn, enlisted into the [group of] students; that man who pretends to give instruction does not have the knowledge to teach. The theatre and the hippodrome flourish, while philosophy and the Muses fall into terrible neglect. — (Aeneas, Theophrastus)*

*A. You seem to me sufficiently initiated into the mysteries of philosophy, and not an uncultured man, uninitiated in his soul about either such sacred rites or such oral teachings. In addition, you also want to be a public figure....But tell me, sir, how is the interpreter of the doctrines of Plato and Aristotle, who has left Athens, but came from [Proclus], the philosopher who is especially deficient in philosophy and wisdom? [This philosopher] now boasts that he is wise in the city of Alexander, and professes to make others wise harmoniously...*

*B You seem to me to be inquiring about Ammonius, dear sir. With such words you are accustomed to jeer at him.*

*A. ...Mortal fear holds me in agony in case he fill the young men with his idle talk. For that man craftily corrupts the young men's souls, renouncing both God and the truth as he does. — (Zacharias, Ammonius)*

*Just like a teacher of children, [God] introduced the first elements to them, knowing that once they had learned them, other teachers would come, who would teach and transmit the more perfect knowledge. — (Procopius, Commentary on Genesis)*

These works by Aeneas, Zacharias, and Procopius, thinkers associated with Gazan rhetorical schools from the late fifth century, appear to tell standard stories. Aeneas esteems ancient knowledge, including the Neoplatonism of Hierocles (fl. 440). The *Theophrastus* is the earliest of the three works, written after 484 and before c. 490, when Zacharias began composing his work with a copy of Aeneas' dialogue on his desk. The dialogue sets itself clearly in the Platonic tradition by recalling Plato's Protagoras, the 'wisest of his generation' (σοφωτάτῳ μὲν δήπου τῶν γε νῦν) (*Prot.* 309d). Aeneas uses classical clichés to bemoan the fact that the sacred mysteries of classical philosophy are being taught badly to apathetic youth. Classical knowledge defines a virtuous public life, but the signs of demise are apparent as Philosophia's charges frequent the theatre and hippodrome instead of her school. In his *Ammonius*, Zacharias considers some of the same themes, and elsewhere similarly claims Platonic lineage, setting his dialogues in a place suitable for philosophy (*Ammonius* 47ff.; cf. *Phaedr.* 227a–229b). But Zacharias ridicules Philosophia, who is characterized as a threat. Those who want to be Christian citizens may be corrupted by her, particularly by her representative in Alexandria, Ammonius (435/445–517/526), or still worse, by Proclus (411–485) and his successors in Athens. For Zacharias, Christian identity is constructed by emphasizing conflict and difference. In the third extract, Procopius, Zacharias' contemporary who was probably writing in the early years of the sixth century, has left philosophy behind, basing his work on divine revelation. The world has moved from paganism to Christianity, from the classical world to the early medieval era, from governors to bishops, from students to disciples.

Yet such a neat picture of progressive departure from the classical world through a process of cultural and intellectual conflict is much too simple. Interactions between diverse groups in the Gazan schools and wider cultural trends at the turn of the sixth century make for a richer picture of cultural and intellectual collaboration, and for appropriation and adaptation of ideas, beliefs, and practices. At Gaza in the late sixth century, we are fortunate to have a diverse range of evidence from rhetorical and philosophical schools, monasteries, and the archaeological record, alongside philosophical, theological, rhetorical, and poetic writings, and much comparative material from other late-antique cities, which allow us to construct a picture of a society undergoing a process of transition. This book aims to elucidate this transition by exploring the writings of Aeneas, Zacharias, and Procopius on the subject of the creation and eternity of the world. Through an analysis of how these writers seek to effect change in their local cultures, I aim to explain the distinctive features of late-antique Gazan society and intellectual culture. Throughout, I offer a dual focus on cultural history sensitive to ideas and on intellectual history as culturally situated ideas. Cultural and intellectual history are richer if practised together, so while Part One (Chapters 2–3) focuses on cultural history and Part Two (Chapters 4–5) emphasizes intellectual problems, I aim to enrich both by placing them in dialogue.

The intellectual contributions of the three Gazans within the history of ideas are significant and their writings have been largely overlooked. Their dialogues cast new light on a long-running and influential late-antique philosophical debate about the creation and eternity of the world. Earlier in the fifth century, the Neoplatonic philosopher Proclus of Athens had published his *Eighteen Arguments on the Eternity of the World*. His magisterial *Commentary on Plato's Timaeus*, with its five pages for every lemma of Plato's original, also brought questions about the creation and eternity of the world to new prominence in late-antique philosophy. Such questions had long been debated, and much of Proclus' work is an analysis and synthesis of earlier opinions. But his works gave the problem new philosophical precision and intellectual momentum. Whether or not Proclus was himself motivated to write these works because of impertinent Christians in the Athenian schools, his works were a major stimulus, directly and indirectly, for the later treatment of the topic by pagan and Christian philosophers in the fifth- and sixth-

century schools. The intellectual background to the Gazans' contribution (within Neoplatonism and Christianity) is the subject of Chapter 4.

The three Gazans contribute to an intermediary stage in the debate, responding in part to Proclus as well as considering problems generated from within Christianity. The creation debates thus place Gaza on the intellectual map of late antiquity, demonstrating that Gaza was well integrated into networks of late-antique education without being itself a major centre of Neoplatonic thought. The distinctiveness of the Gazans' intellectual contribution therefore helps to identify unique aspects of Gazan society (Chapters 5 and 6). Gazan thinkers contributed in distinctive ways to debates more commonly associated with Alexandria and Athens. The Gazan debates are also significant for the history of ideas partly because of the framework they provide for the later more narrowly Neoplatonic arguments in the sixth century. In this episode, John Philoponus' Christian-Neoplatonist treatise against Proclus' *Eighteen Arguments*, published in the year Justinian closed the Academy in Athens, was attacked by the Neoplatonist Simplicius as well as in the idiosyncratic contributions of the Egyptian merchant and monk, Cosmas Indicopleustes. Chapter 7 concludes the book with an analysis of the distinctiveness of the Gazan contribution when compared to these later debates.

The Gazans use Neoplatonic categories to argue that only the persons of the Trinity can be coeternal, and they reject the Neoplatonic idea that the world is eternal (and central Neoplatonic concepts of creation by emanation and return) in the process. A key element for all the thinkers analysed in the debate is how to use the doctrine of creation to elucidate the question of divine and human freedom, and so to explore the related problem of evil. For each thinker, physics moves to ethics, and eschatology becomes the foundation of soteriology. The emphasis on eschatology expands the Neoplatonic focus on arguments about the temporal finitude or infinity of the world from the beginning to considerations of a possible end-point of the universe. Neoplatonists and Christians differ in how they configure these categories, but a common concern about explaining and understanding evil emerges from the debate and may be taken as characteristic of late-antique thought.

These arguments, and their relation to earlier and later debates between Christians and Neoplatonists, are the subject of the second part of this book. In the first part, I set the Gazan writings in their broader cultural context and ask how they sought to reconfigure their local cultures through their respective writings. In Chapter 2, I sketch the contours of the local cultures which gave Gazan society its distinctive characteristics at the turn of the sixth century, and I explore ways in which these local cultures formed their identities in creative interactions. The creation and maintenance of power imbalances between these groups through the construction of difference is just one component of their social interactions. The porous boundaries of the monasteries, rhetorical schools, and their members' religious and philosophical affiliations are evidence for more dynamic ways in which the local cultures formed their identities. This theme of dynamic and fluid identity formation continues in Chapter 3, where I examine how Aeneas, Zacharias, and Procopius perceived their local cultures and outline their attempts to make others accept their worldview. Since ideas are always culturally situated and not mere epiphenomena of power relations or material conditions, exploring the logic of the Christian and Neoplatonic arguments helps to define what was distinctive about different groups within the Gazan schools, and thus to characterize more precisely late-antique Gazan society as a whole. Thus, the chapters on the intellectual history of the creation debates in the second half of the book add finer details to the construction of cultures analysed in Part One.

In setting the works of Aeneas, Procopius, and Zacharias at the heart of my analysis, I do not claim that their works are strikingly original (although they have unique and original contributions to make). But unlike the eccentric geniuses who are often the subject of histories of ideas, they can be taken as



representative of generally accepted norms of thought and practice among their contemporaries in educated Gazan society. When they seek to reconfigure power relations in their local cultures, we should read them as identifying real **(p.5)** cultural problems that exercised the attention of a range of Christian thinkers in the Gazan schools. And when they engage with Neoplatonic ideas and seek to rebut them, we can assume that the intellectual problems they identify, and the argument strategies they employ, were more generally relevant in Gazan society.

In the remainder of this introduction I set out briefly the methods and analytical categories by which I interpret the texts. A continuing, if largely subterranean, argument of the book is that cultural and intellectual history can best illumine and support each other through the method of elucidation of problems set out below. I also contribute to recent studies which move beyond a paradigm of conflict in reconstructing late-antique culture. The chapter concludes with short biographical introductions to Aeneas, Zacharias, and Procopius.

### Culture and Ideas, Conflict and Identity

A central analytical category throughout this book is the concept of a ‘local culture’. By this I mean a social group within a society, which shares many of the assumptions, beliefs, and practices of the society as a whole, and hence its members accept allegiance to that society, but which also shares a set of characteristics which give it a distinctive identity and may sometimes bring it into tension with the general society or other local cultures. Such a culture is a complex of shared symbols and practices which is contingent on the actions of agents, changeable and time-dependent, interactive and non-discrete, and heterogeneous and contested. It is always richly steeped in time—events leave their mark on the trajectory of people’s lives, and structures of meaning are created and changed as people perform meaningful acts in meaningful lives. Societies are not totalizing but are instead made up of many different local cultures, themselves the product of internal disagreements and negotiations and external interactions. Culture is a product of internal coherences, disagreements, and negotiations. It does consolidate groups, but it may also provide the means for its own subversion. The particular historical setting of Gaza, and the experiences of each of the thinkers I analyse, as well as how they seek to use the resources available to them—intellectual, geographical, institutional, economic, and symbolic—are central to my argument. On the side of intellectual history, this emphasis on local cultures helps to produce a more refined account of differences within Christianity which does not reduce to the identification of doctrinal conflict or heresy hunting. It counteracts the tendency to characterize Christianity as a unified monolith. Similarly in the case of cultural history, I paint a picture of tensions and exchanges within and between distinct and overlapping local cultures, and thereby reconstruct some culturally binding shared assumptions in Gazan society, considered as a complex of overlapping local cultures.

A performance metaphor may usefully encapsulate much of this conceptualization of culture and identity. The metaphor takes seriously agency, temporal and spatial setting, the symbols people can employ, the particular, historically contingent material and institutional situations in which they are placed, and the actions they perform. The concept of culture I work with accounts for the virtuosity and improvisations of the performers (agency), the sets they have (the institutions and built environment of Gaza, Alexandria, and Berytus), the props they use (material resources), the languages they can speak (predominantly Greek), the dialogues they participate in (different local communities such as the monks, the students, the lay public, the philosophers) and the audiences they address (Christians of various types, Neoplatonists).

In providing a detailed description of the characteristics of different local cultures and the ways in which they interacted, I offer an account of how individuals and groups go about forming their ideas and identities. Personal and cultural beliefs and identity are not simply the sum of attempts to differentiate oneself or one's local culture from another. Such a model, like its related sister-model of cultural and intellectual interaction as conflict which has also been popular in late-antique studies, requires modification. Individuals and local cultures do try to distinguish themselves intellectually and socially from others by emphasizing real and imagined differences or conflicts, but my claim is that both individuals and groups are more heterogeneous, open, and inconsistent than such models assume, so that conflict or the construction of difference is too blunt a model by which to seek to understand cultural and interpersonal interactions and the personal and social changes these interactions bring about. Sandwell has recently argued that 'discourse [of any sort is] particularly suited to constructing identities because of [its] use of clear-cut categories and contrasting oppositions to create meaning and structure', yet few authors always make their categories perfectly clear and meaning and structure can be created through means other than contrasts. The openness of texts is partly an index of the heterogeneity of the cultures by which they are generated, to say nothing of the complexities, inconsistencies, and fallibility of their authors. Intellectual and cultural formation is as much about appropriating and adapting valued characteristics of other people and groups as it is about marking boundaries between people and cultures.

Of course, there are many individuals and groups within society which are aggressive in defining themselves through conflict with others. And many of the sources available to us for the study of late antiquity may easily be interpreted as fitting this more clear-cut model. Sandwell helpfully argues that some discourses seek to become totalizing, thus acting as an ideology which sets 'its agenda and masks the fact that its representation both has an agenda and that there could be other representations and agendas'. A 'fluid' approach to religious identity, which understands religion mainly as a support for valued social practices or civic life and otherwise minimizes its importance in many public settings, has raised the ire of some types of Christians in all ages, and at times their corresponding totalization of religious identity in the face of such apparent accommodation with the surrounding culture may indeed amount to 'ideological and rule-bound impositions of religious identity'.

In the case of late-antique Gaza, Aeneas, Procopius, and Zacharias all seek to construct exclusive religious allegiances and this construction is achieved partly by constructing a discursive conflict between themselves and others in the schools. Some of their least appealing arguments are designed to marginalize their opponents by painting pagan religion as politically subversive. In these arguments, the Gazans invoke and help to strengthen increasing imperial suppression of religious difference. Yet other voices speak through these apparently aggressive texts. While the Gazans thus partly construct their arguments and preferred religious identity through conflict and opposition, we also find them quietly borrowing and adapting ideas or proudly claiming other identities they share with their non-Christian neighbours. Careful examination of their works reveals elements of Gazan society more open to difference and supports a model which takes conflict as just one element in the construction of ideas and associated cultural practices and personal identities.

The method of elucidation of problems, which seeks to interrogate and explain the cultural and intellectual problems faced by a historical actor is expansive enough to account for culture as I have conceptualized it and moves beyond models of identity construction based on ideological construction of difference. Elucidation of problems asks: 'What problems are particular people trying to solve through this particular act?' An advantage of this method is that it is equally useful for 'cultural' and 'intellectual' histories. It provides mechanisms for 'historians of ideas' to 'learn to think the thoughts of others, as a

philosopher must learn to think his own', based on the principle that understanding thinkers means thinking 'as they thought and [seeing] things in their way'. While 'cultural' historians have not used it explicitly, the method is appropriate, since it is consistent with a rich understanding of the concept of culture. Elucidation of problems allows so-called intellectual historians to reconstruct symbols and practices employed by thinkers in their arguments. Analogously, cultural historians can use the method to analyse how symbols and practices are applied in other domains of social action. Hence, this method can be useful for helping intellectual and cultural historians work together profitably. The application of a method of elucidation of problems is designed to facilitate careful attention both to the standards of rationality which govern the arguments as well as to the social and cultural conventions and practices which give them shape.

### Introducing Aeneas, Zacharias, and Procopius

It remains to introduce Aeneas, Zacharias, and Procopius. Given that I am largely concerned with cultural specificity, my use of the adjective 'Gazan' to describe three thinkers with considerably different associations with the city requires explanation. We hear of 'Gaza schools' (rhetorical or monastic) and 'Gazan monasticism', and we read that Aeneas, Zacharias, and Procopius are 'Gazan thinkers'. Each of these labels elides differences. Browning has drawn attention to stylistic differences between Aeneas and Procopius; each thinker writes different sorts of works; each spends different amounts of time in Gaza. Each studied in Gaza, but while Aeneas and Procopius made their homes there, Zacharias only briefly returned to his birthplace, Gaza's port-town, after studying in Alexandria and Berytus, before making his career elsewhere. The geographical label also masks diversity: Gaza can be used to refer to the town of Gaza as well as its port-town, Maiuma, which had significantly different social profiles. What is the value of the term?

Despite these difficulties, describing the three thinkers as 'Gazan' captures something of the complexity and specificity of their experiences. Apart from particular disputes (e.g. about church governance) between Gaza and Maiuma, the word 'Γάζα' in the ancient sources can refer to an amalgam of these localities. Zacharias, born in Maiuma, can describe a fellow student 'Thomas the Sophist, who loves Christ in everything, and who is, like me, from Gaza' (VSev PO 2.1 23,18–24,1). The interactions between urban, semi-urban, semi-rural, and port-town 'Gazans' help to create the 'Gazan' culture I analyse and elucidate. So one may examine the influence of different local cultures within Gaza, without doing away with the usefulness of the term to describe the sum total of local cultures in this area of Palestina Prima. Thus this difficulty about how to use the term 'Gaza' is an example of the difficulty of conceptualizing culture as, on the one hand, the broad and loosely bound conceptual schemes and practices which unite a society at a macro level, and, on the other hand, as the symbols and practices which bind groups within the wider society at the local level.

Aeneas, a leading Gazan sophist, was the earliest of the three. Born in the first third of the fifth century, he probably did not live to see the sixth. Aeneas may have studied under the Neoplatonic philosopher Hierocles of Alexandria; his dialogue is evidence that he knew Hierocles' works. Zacharias provides evidence for Aeneas' reputation as a philosopher, and also connects him to the monastic communities in Gaza. There was a productive overlap between the monasteries and the schools, which makes late-antique Gaza distinctive (see further Chapter 2).

Zacharias describes Aeneas as 'the grand and wise Christian sophist from the town of Gaza' (VSev PO 2.1 90) yet goes on to speak of Aeneas' philosophical interests. As in earlier generations, sophists in Gaza were more than rhetorical teachers; they had wider theological and philosophical interests. According to Zacharias' admiring, hagiographic account of Abba Isaiah, a leading Gazan figure

in the non-Chalcedonian camp, Aeneas' expertise in philosophy was surpassed by the untrained holy man's. Zacharias has Aeneas explain that

Often, if I came across some problem in a certain place concerning a word from Plato, Aristotle, or Plotinus, and I could not find a solution to it among those who teach and interpret their opinions, I would ask [Abba Isaiah] to make their intention and purpose clear to me as to what they wanted to say, and he would illumine and reveal the meaning and purpose of the passage, and he would not only redress its error but also restore the truth of Christian teaching. (Vls 8; my translation from the Latin)

From Procopius we learn nothing of Aeneas' philosophical accomplishments, but he does praise Aeneas' legal expertise (Procopius of Gaza, *Ep.* 82; cf. Aeneas, *Ep.* 3).

Epiphanius 5 (*PLRE* II), a student of Aeneas and addressee of two letters from him (*Epp* 12, 23), wrote an epigram in praise of his teacher (Εἰς Αἰνεῖαν τὸν Γαζαῖον), which heralds Aeneas in conventional if inflated terms as being 'the most eminent of rhetors in the Attic art'. Aeneas 'excelled both his contemporaries and forefathers in more holy speeches'. Gaza, claims Epiphanius, should take to heart the fact that it was fortunate enough to count such a father among its citizens. These testimonia point to a figure who was socially influential and educated in philosophy, theology, and rhetoric.

Aeneas' extant oeuvre comprises a set of twenty-five letters and the dialogue which is of central interest to this study, the *Theophrastus*. The *Theophrastus* was written after 484 and before Zacharias' dialogue (489/90) (on Zacharias' dating, see further below). Aeneas' letters provide a window into his contexts and those of his correspondents, who include presbyters, rhetoricians, officials, and other intellectuals, and provide useful detail about the social characteristics of Gaza in this period.

Aeneas' dialogue has three characters: Theophrastus, a Greek philosopher, Euxitheus, a Christian who has studied philosophy, and Egyptus, a Christian who plays only a small part in the dialogue. Adverse winds blow Euxitheus' ship off course and he cannot continue his journey, so he settles down to a philosophical conversation with the Greek traveller and philosopher Theophrastus and Euxitheus' associate, Egyptus, on topics including the pre-existence and immortality of the soul, the creation of the cosmos, and the resurrection of bodies. The limited previous scholarship on the dialogue focuses on sources (Christian and philosophical) or, more recently, on what the dialogue may suggest about power conflicts in late-antique schools.

The dialogue form chosen by Aeneas and, later, by Zacharias presents several challenges of interpretation to which we will return. The dialogue genre may reflect social and intellectual conflict and collaboration. The extent to which the dialogues aim to perform or allow real intellectual and cultural polysemy is an open question. Aeneas' choice of dialogue form may be seen as creating a space in which different local cultures can find their voice, yet the author carefully controls what the different characters are allowed to say in the dialogue, and we may often suspect that the genre is being used ideologically, to control what can be imagined in Aeneas' desired society. Analysing these tendencies reveals some of Aeneas' most deeply held commitments, but a concern for providing an intellectually compelling account of Christian doctrine makes such power discourse analyses of the dialogue insufficient. The dialogue also reveals a genuine knowledge about, and positive evaluation of, philosophical argument. Aeneas wants to persuade his philosophically inclined audience partly on the basis of argument, even though his dialogue also functions to disempower them in various ways.

Zacharias Scholasticus (or Zachariah Rhetor) (c. 465–post 536) was perhaps some twenty to thirty years younger than Aeneas, whom he describes as 'a great teacher'. Aeneas' dialogue provides an intellectual model for Zacharias' *Ammonius*. He died some time after attending the Council of

Constantinople in 536. Zacharias studied rhetoric under Sopater 3 (PLRE II) and philosophy under Ammonius in Alexandria before undertaking legal studies in Berytus. While in Alexandria, he witnessed and recounted the turmoil which arose from Pagan–Christian tensions in the schools (VSev). In Berytus, he was a member of the so-called *philoponoi*, a group of students who performed various charitable works, and sought to preserve Christian orthodoxy in the school, which Zacharias in his *Life of Severus* depicts as potentially spiritually dangerous. After working as an advocate (*scholasticus*) in Constantinople, he was made (Chalcedonian) bishop of Mitylene. This appointment should caution against reading Zacharias as a strongly committed non-Chalcedonian, although political pressure to change ecclesiastical allegiance could be strong. A letter from the non-Chalcedonian Patriarch Severus, written when he was exiled in around 519–521, may refer to our Zacharias, and states that ‘those without [i.e. the Chalcedonians] are at peace with you’. If so, there is evidence that Zacharias, despite his friendship with Severus, had moved to the Chalcedonian camp by the early years of the reign of Justin and Justinian. Zacharias’ dialogue, the work of most relevance to this study, shows no signs of non-Chalcedonian emphasis.

Zacharias is variously referred to in the manuscripts as ‘Zacharias Scholasticus’, ‘Zacharias Rhetor’, and ‘Zacharias, bishop of Mitylene’. Honigmann’s case that these figures should also be identified with the Zacharias who was an imperial official and a brother of Procopius of Gaza is circumstantial, but persuasive. If the identification of Zacharias Scholasticus, author of the *Ammonius* and future bishop of Mitylene with Zacharias the brother of Procopius is accepted, it places all three Gazan thinkers in an elite stratum of society with strong connections to the imperial court.

Zacharias wrote church history, biography, and dogmatic works. All his writings may be interpreted as polemics, and his lives of key non-Chalcedonian figures are responsible for much of the scholarship which emphasizes religious and social conflict in this period. The biographies justify their heroes against Chalcedonian attack, the ecclesiastical history takes sides on doctrinal disputes, and the titles of the works against the Manichees (Ἀντίρρησις; *Capita adversos Manichaeos*) set the tone for works which conform to the ‘anathema’ genre. Yet while Zacharias’ dialogue resonates with this general enjoyment of polemic and disputation, it also reveals cultural complexity which a focus on conflict misses. Zacharias was a writer who identified problems and tenaciously tried to solve them. This fact, together with the uncertainty surrounding his biography, makes elucidation of problems useful for entering his thought-world, and opens avenues by which to explore cultural adaptations and appropriations.

His dialogue, the *Ammonius*, is the focus of this book. It depicts a Christian teacher strengthening the faith of an Alexandrian student ‘slipping towards paganism’. Zacharias achieves the goal of educating the student by recounting a series of mini-dialogues he claims to have had with Ammonius and the Neoplatonist iatrosophist Gessius (fl. late fifth century). The mini-dialogues investigate creation, resurrection, the eternity of the cosmos and matter, the forms, and the Trinity. The dialogue ends, like the *Theophrastus*, in prayer: the student’s faith is renewed by Zacharias’ teaching. Recent theories positing a mid-sixth-century date for sections of the dialogue are unconvincing. It seems most likely that it should be dated to around 490. Particularly, the idea that the dialogue was revised to include a prominent sixth-century pagan doctor after Ammonius’ death seem to fail, given that Gessius is elsewhere described as a doctor who flourished under the emperor Zeno (Damascius, *VIs*). The dialogue’s intellectual debt to Aeneas of Gaza is marked, explained by the recent influence of that thinker and the Gazan milieu, although it also inscribes Zacharias’ Alexandrian experiences.

The questions about the genuine openness of Aeneas’ dialogue also apply to Zacharias’. In this regard, it is important that Zacharias moves the philosophical conversations from the traditional *locus*

*philosophicus* of a shady outdoor setting as in the *Phaedrus* ultimately to the confines of a great church, although a literary allusion at the end of the dialogue returns us to the *Phaedrus*. Zacharias' attempt to use the dialogue form to limit social difference is explored in Chapter 3. Like Aeneas, he displays direct knowledge of his Neoplatonic opponents, and like all three Gazans he also seeks to solve intra-Christian problems in his dialogue. A central intellectual problem the dialogue explores is how to think about the freedom of God and humans as part of a more general argument about how the first principle of being is also the first principle of goodness. This emphasis, as in Aeneas before him, makes the debate about the creation and eternity of the world also a debate about ethics. The dialogue also introduces a new concept of eternity which makes a significant difference to how Christians think about the eternity of the world. As for Aeneas, this new concept is partly motivated by Trinitarian considerations.

Finally, we come to Procopius of Gaza (c. 465–528). He wrote a large corpus of letters which helps to provide us with biographical detail and rich information about Gazan culture. Two of his brothers, Philippus and Zacharias (whether ours or not), were at some stage lawyers and officials in the imperial court at Constantinople. Procopius won a rhetorical contest in Alexandria in his youth and began teaching rhetoric by his early twenties after turning down offers of employment in Antioch, Berytus, Caesarea, and Tyre (Choricus, *Fun. or. in Proc.* 12, 15). He is best known for his panegyric for Anastasius and his large corpus of letters. Through this correspondence, we are provided with a picture of a man deeply involved in civic affairs. We see him writing letters of preferment and reference for students and teachers; he contributes to the political life of Gaza, including organizing imperial embassies and mediating disputes; he is in demand as a sophist, both for civic occasions in Gaza and for teaching in urban centres, including Antioch and Caesarea. He wrote a variety of works, including a Metaphrasis of Homer, speeches (ekphrasis, panegyric, monody), letters, and exegetical works. He may have written philosophical works against Proclus, although these are either lost, or fragmentary and disputed.

Some categorize these works by dividing them into obviously and dubiously Christian texts, making Procopius appear somewhat schizophrenic. The Christian Procopius, author of the exegetical works (the philosophical ones are generally left out of this picture), displayed no great knowledge of classical authors, whereas the non-Christian Procopius, sophist and rhetor worthy of the Atticism he aspired to, was thoroughly steeped in the classics, including Homer, Hesiod, Thucydides, Herodotus, Isocrates, Demosthenes, Plato, Aristotle, Euripides, and many others. This marked difference in sources used in various works has led to suggestions that Procopius was either converted late, or else that we have two 'Procopiuses'. Generic differences, where different source materials are expected because different writers are taken as authoritative for different subjects and occasions, provide a more promising solution to the variety and particularity of Procopius' use of earlier writers.

Aly long ago suggested that the letters may have been written to be sent but were then used as teaching materials, and closer attention to the cultural context of the rhetorical schools helpfully moves beyond generic or religious categorizations of Procopius' works. The Panegyric may have been presented at a public occasion and was written to fulfil Procopius' duty as a public rhetor, a duty which fell to teachers of rhetoric. The *ekphrasis* similarly function as rhetorical exercises. Ter Haar Romeny has suggested that the commentaries, which are largely geared towards basic biblical literacy, also fulfil an educational function in the rhetorical schools, and his philosophical interests are also plausibly generated in the school context.

I focus on Procopius' *Commentary on Genesis*, particularly its preface, and the *Refutatio*. Significant problems of interpretation encircle both these works. In the case of the *Commentary*, it is clear that Procopius used a catena, drawing on it systematically to furnish his work. The originality of his contribution is thus called into question, although Procopius had independent access to earlier sources

and the section relating to chapter one of Genesis, which is most relevant for this book, is also most independent of the earlier tradition. In addition, the process of collating, editing, merging, and summarizing earlier sources can introduce a new logic, one in which distinctive Gazan concerns may be heard.

Procopius' rebuttal of Proclus' philosophy was called into question when fragments of it were discovered to be identical to a later, twelfth-century treatise by Nicholas of Methone. Yet a plausible case for authenticity, while insecure, remains possible. I use the fragments as traces of sixth-century views with care strictly to limit the conclusions drawn from them. To underline the continuing uncertainty of attribution, I label the author of the relevant fragment 'Procopius(?)'.

Procopius' biblical commentary places him very firmly within an intra-Christian context, yet commentary was the dominant mode of intellectual endeavours in the rhetorical, philosophical, and medical schools of late antiquity, so Procopius may be seen as valuing contemporary models of scholarship while simultaneously using his commentary to construct a Christian chain of authority. The early part of his commentary seems directed against a philosophically aware audience. The extent of his engagement with Neoplatonism in particular is contested, but his engagement with many of the problems which exercised Neoplatonists, albeit within a Christian theological frame, makes his treatment a good introduction to relevant problems in Aeneas' and Zacharias' dialogues, and it is therefore analysed first.

All three Gazans have cultural and intellectual problems to solve. They are concerned with establishing their own power and demonstrating the truth of their arguments. Their various works are partly generated by cultural problems in and beyond the Gazan schools and by intellectual challenges from contemporary Neoplatonists, philosophically inclined Christians, those who would attempt to reject philosophy entirely, and from local monks. While intellectual and cultural problems cannot ultimately be disentangled, for the purposes of clarity of analysis it is useful to separate them initially. Intellectual challenges to the Gazans are explored in Part Two. In Part One, I use the texts as case studies of cultural problems. A key cultural problem is how to limit the power of pagan religion in the schools and more widely in a culture still largely shaped by the classical world without thereby losing the valued social status which attached to classical learning and which supported the Gazan rhetorical schools. To begin to see how the Gazans went about solving this cultural problem, and the strategies they used to shape their local cultures, we must first gain a clearer picture of the constituent local cultures of Gazan society and the sources available for its study.

The study concludes by identifying ways in which the Gazans' contribution intersects with the later creation debates between Philoponus, Simplicius, and Cosmas Indicopleustes to reveal by comparison the distinctiveness of the Gazan arguments. Philoponus' contribution in the *Contra Proclum* and *Contra Aristotelem* is clearly more philosophically sophisticated. The chapter then draws out the main conclusions of the study, identifying the cultural specificity of the different groups that together constituted late-antique Gazan society. The study of the writings of Aeneas, Zacharias, and Procopius suggests that late-antique Gaza was a society in transition, where the identity of local cultures and individuals was heterogeneous and fluid, formed through interaction, creative exchange, competition, and conflict.

## Creatio Continua

The debate about the creation and eternity of the world continued well into the sixth century. In the same year that Justinian closed the Neoplatonic school in Athens, the Christian Neoplatonist John Philoponus wrote a work entitled *Against Proclus on the Eternity of the World*. The Neoplatonist philosopher Simplicius took up the standard for Athens, and Jerusalem found its champion in Cosmas

Indicopleustes, an Alexandrian traveller, merchant, and monk, who was incensed to find a fellow Christian accepting so much Neoplatonic philosophy. The Gazans' contribution may be read as keeping the philosophical conversation alive between Proclus and Philoponus and as one stage in the development of Christian rebuttals of the Neoplatonic idea of the eternity of the world.

The debates between Philoponus and Simplicius have been extensively studied; more perhaps remains to be written on Cosmas' contribution. In this brief section I gesture towards these debates and suggest possible intersections between the Gazans and the later Alexandrian controversies, identifying initial similarities and differences for further exploration.

While Philoponus' Christian beliefs led him to criticize Neoplatonic arguments for the eternity of the world, his *Contra Proclum* stays within a Neoplatonic frame to the extent that it may be read as aiming to remove inconsistencies within Neoplatonism. This work, together with the *Contra Aristotelem*, shows Philoponus sharply and perceptively using Neoplatonic arguments and turning them against Neoplatonists. He knows the detail: we know Proclus' arguments for the eternity of the world because Philoponus quoted them in order to provide a point-by-point, systematic, and penetrating rebuttal. If we take Procopius' most successful argument against the Neoplatonists, that they should accept the creation of matter from nothing since they believe in the creation of form from nothing, we find Philoponus arguing with much greater philosophical rigor and precision, and with much clearer knowledge of the detail of the Aristotelian basis for the Neoplatonic position. He makes the claim within an argument that motion was not eternal (*Contra Aristotelem* in Simplicius *in Phys.* 1142,1–28) and strengthens it with the claim that God can destroy matter into not-being, just as he does with form (*Contra Aristotelem* in Simplicius *in Phys.* 1177,10–26).

This brings out one important difference between the Gazans and Philoponus. While the Gazans were interested in Neoplatonic philosophy, they did not attempt to advance a Neoplatonic 'research programme'. They might have applauded Philoponus' lemma-by-lemma refutation of Proclus, but they would simultaneously have been bemused by it. Philoponus' engagement with Neoplatonism reaches a very different level of philosophical sophistication and points to a stronger and more vibrant contemporary Neoplatonic scholarly community in Alexandria well into the sixth century.

Nevertheless, I have identified some areas where the Gazans' thought overlaps with Philoponus'. Some, including treatment of the Atticus-Plutarch interpretation of *Timaeus* 28b can be put down to shared general knowledge of key points in Neoplatonic interpretations of the origins of the cosmos. In this category, they share arguments about the standard images of God as a craftsman or an architect, or standard models for creation, including the image of the shadow and the emanation of light from the sun. Many similarities can be explained by shared stimulus from Proclus' fifth-century works. For example, both the Gazans and Philoponus deal with questions Proclus asks in his *Eighteen Arguments*. If god is good, how could he allow the cosmos to be dissolved? If there was a time when the universe did not exist, how can we speak of God as a creator? Given that time and the heaven coexist, and time has neither beginning nor end, how can the heaven come to an end? Other shared problems seem to arise from standard school criticisms of Christian ideas about creation. For example, the Gazans and Philoponus both respond to the criticism that God should have created the world to be eternal originally, instead of making it mortal first, and then promising to transform it into immortality. Further, Zacharias and Philoponus both attribute the concept of coeternity to the Neoplatonists (Zacharias to Ammonius and Philoponus to Proclus), and attempt to show the weakness of this concept in similar ways, perhaps pointing to ways in which a Trinitarian frame shapes the arguments in both episodes.



Other passages suggest a connection between the Gazans' works and Philoponus'. This is not the place to enumerate all of them. A brief look at one example may suffice to demonstrate both the ways in which the Gazan episode can be seen to be contributing to the long-running Christian-Neoplatonic debate about creation as well as the ways in which the Gazan arguments differ from Philoponus' more explicitly and carefully philosophical contribution. I take the case of Proclus' fourth argument, which is about the impiety which follows if one believes that the cosmos is not everlasting, given that if the cosmos is not everlasting, there is alteration in the creator, who is sometimes not creating and sometimes creating.

Zacharias' arguments against these points have in part been analysed above. His key argument was that since God does not create in time, the initial act of creation is not an alteration in time. Near the end of his dialogue, he uses the example of the creation of individuals. Socrates, Plato, and any individual are created by God, as Ammonius agrees. So how is it, asks Zacharias, that they are not everlasting? And why does the generation and corruption of individuals not worry the Neoplatonists? Zacharias does not drive home the point that the alteration of creatures does not imply the alteration of God, but the background of Proclus' fourth argument suggests that that is the direction in which he is heading. By contrast, Philoponus has an extended passage on different kinds of alterations which sits within the Iamblichan tradition of Neoplatonic thought about whether God can have knowledge of individuals or the future without thereby being bound up in particulars or time (*Contra Proclum* 4.9; 16.1–4). Returning to Zacharias, Ammonius is made to agree that even though individuals undergo corruption, God is still Good. He is also made to agree that the generation and corruption of such individuals does not make them less good, or imply envy in God. This goes to Proclus' first argument, that if God creates a creation which is not everlasting, he would be creating ungenerously. That is, the creation of a finite universe would be the act of a jealous God, and in the Good there is no envy at all, as Plato put it, so God would not be the Good. Ammonius goes on to argue that the sun is the cause of corruption and generation on earth, making a Neoplatonic distinction between the different sorts of causes at the different levels of the cosmos and Zacharias responds with the arguments outlined above against the divinity of the sun and the heavens, suggesting that a major concern for Zacharias was pagan religious practices in the schools, such as those of Antonius, whom we recall the Neoplatonist Damascius praised for making Gaza more reverent than it had been.

In his response to Proclus' fourth argument, Philoponus also uses the example of the generation and corruption of individuals (*Contra Proclum* 4.9, 79, 16 ff.). Like Zacharias, he uses the example of the creation and destruction of Socrates and Plato. Like Zacharias, he points out that God's goodness is not called into question by the generation and corruption of individual creations. But unlike Zacharias, he makes the argument about change and alteration much more clearly, and he explicitly makes an argument about the types of changes which should and should not concern a Neoplatonist to support his claim for the continued goodness of God along Neoplatonic lines. Philoponus also goes on immediately to propose an argument about the operation of the sun, but he does not offer the distracting argument about the sun's divinity. Rather, he uses the analogy of how individuals are differently affected by the sun's rays to point out that the sun is not itself altered by the individuals it changes. He completes his argument with the claim Zacharias had earlier made, namely that God has no need of time to produce, but brings all creatures into existence at the instant that he wills them.

It is clear that the structure and content of Philoponus' argument is much more firmly tied to Proclus' Neoplatonism. Philoponus sticks tenaciously and perceptively to the logic of Proclus' arguments, and shows a stronger interest in the detail of arguments within the Neoplatonic tradition. Zacharias, by contrast, does not follow Proclus' logic, and while his arguments resonate against the backdrop of

Proclus' treatise, he has other concerns, partly generated from within Christian doctrinal debates, and partly a function of immediate social problems in the schools, which help to generate arguments that are very different from Philoponus', for all their shared material. Christians among Philoponus' audience needed to be much more deeply knowledgeable about Neoplatonism, and care more about its internal consistency, than the implied audience of either of the dialogues of Aeneas or Zacharias.

Despite the arguments they share, in general, while the Gazans occasionally provide arguments which might bother Neoplatonists on Neoplatonic grounds, and show knowledge of contemporary Neoplatonism even as they misrepresent it in their arguments, their general strategy is to present a coherent picture of their own instead of entering into detailed Neoplatonic argument. In this task, they were aided by discussion about creation in the Judeo-Christian tradition from the New Testament and Hellenistic Judaism to the Cappadocians and beyond. Their deployment of Neoplatonism is mostly general and superficial rather than particular and penetrating; they do not want to be Neoplatonic philosophers. Philoponus, by contrast, was thoroughly at home in Neoplatonism.

Yet despite his undoubted Neoplatonic interests and expertise, Philoponus' *de opificio mundi* left such extended and rigorous Neoplatonic argument behind. It rebuts the scientifically and philosophically questionable but biblically based cosmology of Cosmas Indicopleustes. Scholten has shown that there is a complex relationship between Philoponus' text and the catena tradition on which Procopius also drew for his commentary on Genesis. They inhabit a similar thought-world, where biblical and philosophical discourses concerning creation and the eternity of the world are intertwined. One thinker may mix freely in philosophical and exegetical communities, although Cosmas attempted to construct a new intellectual framework to avoid the philosophers altogether.

Cosmas was appalled that Philoponus would even talk to philosophers. Such Christians are two-faced and lack proper foundations, like empty houses standing high in the air without supports (*Christian Topography* 1.4). He rejects an infinite universe on the grounds that God would have no power to redeem matter or resurrect bodies (*Christian Topography* 3.87). He rejects the idea of revolving heavenly spheres by taking Plato's side in the dispute about whether there are four or five elements. He argues that none of the four elements can move in a circle and that Aristotle's aether could not account for some physical properties of stars and planets even if it existed (*Christian Topography* 1.5–8). The epicycles proposed by astronomers make a mockery of the spherical model of the heavens (*Christian Topography* 1.9–13).

Yet while references to epicycles and Platonic and Aristotelian theories of the elements suggest some knowledge of contemporary science, the reader soon learns that the argument thus far is driven by a purely negative logic. Cosmas does not think that anything like the Greek theory of the elements is true, whether in Platonic or Aristotelian garb. He argues instead for passive matter moved by the divine will alone. Rain falls not because it is water seeking its proper place but because angels carry it according to providential commands (*Christian Topography* 2.84f.). The argument seeks to ensure that God has complete control over matter, thus making belief in the resurrection plausible (cf. 3.61). Cosmas also believed that the earth is flat (e.g. *Christian Topography* 1.5–7; 4.24). The heavens are not spherical because the tabernacle is a type for the universe (e.g. *Christian Topography* 2.3).

With such arguments we have moved into a new epistemology and a new set of truth claims that would utterly transform Christian thought, privilege the Bible as a unique standard of truth, and render Neoplatonic argument unnecessary. Cosmas' arguments on the creation and eternity of the world share only their conclusion with Philoponus and the Gazans. They are evidence for the eclipse of Neoplatonic

argumentation in sections of late-antique society, despite the Gazans' best efforts in the earlier generation to demonstrate the utility of Greek philosophy for Christian thinking.

But Philoponus was also attacked from within Neoplatonism by the pagan Neoplatonist Simplicius. According to Simplicius, Aristotle's best achievement was that he 'proved that the entire structure of nature depends on a cause which is above nature, and that the study of nature depends on metaphysics' [τὴν ὅλην φυσικὴν σύστασιν τῆς ὑπερφυσικῆς αἰτίας καὶ τὴν φυσικὴν θεωρίαν τῆς πρώτης φιλοσοφίας ἐξηγημένην ἔδειξεν] (*in Phys.* VIII, 1366.19–20). Such statements point back to Proclus and his insistence that physics depends on theology. This goes some way towards explaining Simplicius' strong anti-Christian polemic (e.g. *in Phys.* VIII, 1326.37–1327.4). Philoponus is a drunkard who inverts the natural order of things, bringing the sun down to earth and a human into heaven (*in Phys.* VIII, 1330.27ff.). The strength of the polemic, and the explicit rejection of Christianity, is a far cry from Proclus' stony silence about Christianity. Simplicius' explicit rejection of Christianity points to stronger Christian attacks on Neoplatonism by Simplicius' day, consistent with Cosmas' more universally negative attitude towards Neoplatonism. Gaza's late fifth-century engagement with Neoplatonism was possible in part because of a greater cultural acceptance of Neoplatonism in the schools.

## Creation of Ideas and Local Cultures

As Pelikan has it, if counterpoint between Platonism and Christianity is a defining feature of the western intellectual tradition, the *Timaeus* provides the *cantus firmus*. The creation debates in late-antique Gaza, partly stimulated by Proclus' commentary on the *Timaeus*, are one restatement of the theme. They illumine Gazan society by revealing creative, productive, and violent tensions between diverse, overlapping and heterogeneous local cultures, with each performing different allegiances and intellectual stances.

The works of Aeneas, Zacharias, and Procopius reveal late-antique Gaza as a diversity of heterogeneous, changing, and mutually interacting local cultures. Groups that helped to form and define the late-antique schools included the students and teachers, philosophically minded Christians and pagans, Neoplatonists, Christians who were uncomfortable with philosophy, the local bishop, and the Gazan monasteries. Further afield, other educational centres, most importantly Alexandria, Caesarea, and Athens, influenced how the Gazan schools operated. Negotiating lives between these local cultures, Aeneas, Zacharias, and Procopius sought to solve cultural problems about the authority of Christian teachers and holy men, the power of Neoplatonists in the schools and wider society and the fluid religious affiliations of students and teachers.

The defining characteristics of these individual local cultures were contested and only ever loosely coherent; the explanatory categories for this section of Gazan society are interaction, transformation, fluidity, and contest, and no local culture was static or entirely insulated from the others. Terms like 'Christian' and 'pagan' are too blunt for this cultural reality. Monks interacted with teachers and left their mark on the thought of Aeneas and Zacharias; Procopius' biblical commentary draws on Neoplatonism. Since local cultures consisted of members with shared though heterogeneous beliefs, values, and practices, identity in this period was itself heterogeneous, context dependent, contested, and shaped through mutual interaction and adaptation of valued characteristics as well as through the construction of oppositions.

The broad interests of the teachers in Gaza are congruent with these heterogeneous and dynamic local cultures. The Gazan schools are well known for their achievements in rhetoric. Sophists wielded power in society in Kaster's terms as 'guardians of language', and Aeneas' letters cast light on the extent to which social power still inhered in the classical education of late fifth-century Gaza. Yet Aeneas,

Procopius, and Zacharias all display much wider interests, generated by the diversity of the local cultures which interacted with the schools in Gaza. Gaza at the turn of the sixth-century took elements from other intellectual centres, especially Alexandria, Caesarea, and Athens to forge its own distinctive identity, open to differing intellectual systems, engaged in philosophy, science, literary criticism, rhetoric, and theology. The standard picture of Aeneas, Zacharias, and Procopius as sophists rather than philosophers requires re-evaluation. The overlap of philosophy and rhetoric in their cases suggests that the frequent conflation of the categories of rhetor and philosopher in earlier periods continues into the sixth century, although given their allegiance to Christian problems and arguments, and the extent of their rigorous engagement with Neoplatonism, this may be better understood as the merging of the categories of theologian and rhetor in their case.

Their philosophical interests suggest that while classical *paideia* still commanded respect and social power, there was a new need to demonstrate the continuing utility of central elements of classicism, such as Neoplatonism, which were beginning to threaten some Christians. In employing Neoplatonic philosophy within their Christian account of creation, the Gazans reinforced their social power as guardians of classical knowledge and made the case that philosophy remained helpful to explicate and construct Christian theology. Simultaneously, in rebutting Neoplatonic arguments and Neoplatonic philosophers, they neutralized the perceived threat of Neoplatonism to Christian doctrine and belief, reinforced the position of Christian teachers and students in the schools, and sought to defeat Neoplatonic religious claims.

Their theological claims may indicate the rise of the monasteries as potential alternative providers of education. Christian education was beginning to compete with traditional classical education in Gaza, and the Gazans' theological interests may be read as attempts to provide Christian resources within a classical idiom to remain attractive in this new environment. The monasteries may also have provided specific intellectual stimulus, in the case of the Origenist problems explored in Aeneas' dialogue.

Wider Christianization helps to explain other cultural transformations which figure in the Gazans' works. The literary reversals enacted in the dialogues and the way the three authors employed and altered their chosen genres both performed desired cultural transformations and configurations, and provided glimpses of other possible cultural alliances and identities. Aeneas rewrote the philosophical tradition by using the dialogue genre, displaying Christian confidence to engage with and appropriate the classical philosophy while simultaneously displaying the continuing utility and strength of Neoplatonism. Yet in changing the dialogue genre in the direction of question and answer literature, he attempted to develop widespread Christian education and revealed the influence of monasteries on Gazan schools. Zacharias recounted his dialogues in a churchyard, symbolizing the Christian colonization of philosophical thought even as his mini-dialogues set in the Alexandrian classrooms perform real tensions within the schools. Procopius employed the commentary tradition in order to be comprehensible within the classical tradition while constructing a new Christian chain of authority figures.

Late-antique education in Gaza was thus vibrant and culturally diverse. It was at the heart of a number of transformations which constituted and continued to reshape late-antique Gazan society. While there were strong conflicts between competing local cultures in the schools, conflict is much too blunt a category with which to characterize late-antique Gazan society. Gaza's dependence on Alexandria, Athens, and Caesarea, together with its mix of schools and monasteries, suggests an openness in the schools which encouraged overlapping cultures and continual adaptations of elements taken from local cultures different from one's own.

In their different ways, the Gazan authors contributed to the process of framing a new intellectual discourse and thus transforming the wider society. Problems arising in the monasteries and contemporary Trinitarian disputes were explored alongside traditional questions of school philosophy. All three thinkers wrote about creation partly because of tension between foundational Neoplatonic statements and Christian claims. Neoplatonism retained rational weight, yet was reframed and thus ultimately marginalized by (various versions of) the divine plan of salvation. Aeneas, Zacharias, and Procopius sought to marry Greek logic and aspects of Neoplatonic argument and imagery to the proclamations of holy writ and patristic authorities, as well as to liturgical practices and the actions of holy men and other Christian stories.

Hence, among the literary elites to which Aeneas, Procopius, and Zacharias belonged, there was a shared discourse which allowed figures to move between traditionally Hellenic or Christian stories and read them in new ways. Plato was read afresh to support the idea that the creation had an origin and that God will transform mortals into immortality; mythological figures can prefigure events in Christian history and biblical texts can be interpreted using Platonic ideas. The contributions of Aeneas, Procopius, and Zacharias to the debate about creation were made possible by this discourse and simultaneously helped to strengthen and create it. In this way, the creation debates provide a rich case study of the creation of a Christian discourse during a time of intellectual and social transition.

Given the formation and characteristics of this shared discourse, problems apparently internal to Neoplatonism as well as those apparently internal to Christianity were generative of the Gazan works. The *Timaeus* antinomy at 28b and its interpretation among contemporary Neoplatonists were central, but so too were debates about the Trinity and how properly to separate the Christian God from the world. Platonic thinking about the problem of evil, perhaps especially by Hierocles, also influenced Aeneas and Zacharias. The Neoplatonic account of goodness as unity and sameness and its non-deliberative account of the divine also posed problems for the three thinkers, while Origenist ideas from the monasteries entered the debate. These diverse problems help explain why the three Gazans explored the doctrine of creation three centuries after *creatio ex nihilo* had been established in Christian doctrine.

Each writer moved his argument against the eternity of the world from physics to ethics, and ended in soteriology. All three writers claimed that God the creator is also God the lawgiver. Thus creation became part of the story of the history of God's salvific acts. The Neoplatonic belief in the eternity of the world threatened the happy ending of this story, demanding a Christian response. The Gazans argued that God is the efficient and final cause of creation: this would be a crucial continuing claim in the history of ideas, seen again in Simplicius and Philoponus and central to Thomas Aquinas' account of creation. It allowed them to join the first principle of Being with the first principle of Goodness and grounded Aeneas' and Zacharias' interest in ethics. Especially in Aeneas and Zacharias, but also in Procopius, the problems surrounding creation raised questions about divine and human freedom. The Christians differ from their Neoplatonic contemporaries in insisting that creation is a gracious, outwardly directed act of choice by the divine will. God is not free if he did not choose to create, and since what is eternal is necessary, an eternal creation means that God is not free. In this scheme, God's will to create is not dependent on the actual existence of the cosmos. God's act of creation is thus free and entirely gratuitous.

The unification of the first principle of Being with the first principle of Goodness in this gracious act of creation forms a crucial component of the divine plan of salvation, which was central to each of the Gazans. Each writer played with the categories of creation, fall, education through mortal sufferings, incarnation, and final recreation. The precise configurations of these elements are slightly different in

each author. For example, Aeneas did not emphasize the incarnation as strongly as Zacharias did, but spent considerable time discussing the creation and resurrection of souls; his views on the soul would repay more detailed study. Yet for each writer, these basic plot elements provide a framework for their arguments. This frame means that Neoplatonic conclusions must be re-evaluated and often jettisoned. The divine plan of salvation had been crucial to the original Christian apologetic of the second century, especially in Irenaeus and Clement of Alexandria, and its centrality in the works of the three Gazans points at least to a revival of this theme, and possibly to a deeper continuity in Christian thought, a sort of 'Irenaeian revival' between the second and the sixth centuries.

The divine plan also provides a view of history which helps to explain the facility and confidence with which the Gazans interacted and employed ideas from Neoplatonism. If God is continually providentially present in human history, and if all human experience has been summed up and perfected in the incarnation, then Christians can approach Neoplatonism confident that Christian truth sums up and perfects the earlier truths that God communicated to the weaker, childlike intellects of the Jews and the (pre-Christian) Greeks. Christian truth has different yardsticks: the Bible, liturgy, fathers and church councils are authoritative sources of truth. But God also communicated truths to earlier generations in other dispensations of the divine plan. This was a key argument at the start of Procopius' commentary; Aeneas claimed that earlier doctrines should be adhered to where they are truthful. The key point is that truths may be found outside the church, and this facilitates cultural and intellectual interaction between Christians and others.

Of course, the divine plan could be recast to emphasize the perfection of Christians at the present moment of divine-human history. That was how Cosmas Indicopleustes took it, enabling him to argue for a nearly complete rejection of non-Christian claims; the Gazans' own polemic rejection of Neoplatonic ideas often trivialized the thought of their opponents and may be based in part on such an evolutionary triumphalism. Yet the Gazans join the idea that God is perfecting human history to the idea that God has always assisted humans throughout history. Because they recognized that God has not yet completely perfected the cosmos, they could appropriate the 'imperfect' thought systems of the Neoplatonists to construct better but still provisional Christian truth.

This is an example of how the method that runs through this book may unite cultural and intellectual history. The analysis and reconstruction of argument through the elucidation of problems, which brought out the centrality of the divine plan, sheds light on the motivations, mechanics and extent of cultural interactions. Beliefs, symbols, and intellectual commitments, along with power differentials and material constraints, shape cultural action. Similarly, my analysis of the Gazans' cultural problems, especially their anxieties about the social power of pagan Neoplatonists, helps to explain parts of their argument which may otherwise sound somewhat shrill. It reveals groups which were posing social challenges to the members of the schools, thus helping to situate the thinkers' ideas and to identify relevant sources of opposing arguments. Through the different cultural and intellectual reconstructions I have offered in this book, I have presented a case that cultural history should be more expansive than power discourse theory, while intellectual history should be embedded in wider cultural analysis. What this method reveals in late-antique Gaza is a set of cultures in transition, mutually constituting and transforming each other through a fugal pattern of exchange, adaptation, conflict, and collaboration. <>

<>

## Bibliography

**Making the Medieval Relevant: How Medieval Studies Contribute to Improving our Understanding of the Present** edited by Chris Jones, Conor Kostick and Klaus Oschema [Das Mittelalter. Perspektiven mediävistischer Forschung. Beihefte, De Gruyter, 9783110545302]

When scholars discuss the medieval past, the temptation is to become immersed there, to deepen our appreciation of the nuances of the medieval sources through debate about their meaning.

But the past informs the present in a myriad of ways and medievalists can, and should, use their research to address the concerns and interests of contemporary society. This volume presents a number of carefully commissioned essays that demonstrate the fertility and originality of recent work in Medieval Studies. Above all, they have been selected for relevance. Most contributors are in the earlier stages of their careers and their approaches clearly reflect how interdisciplinary methodologies applied to Medieval Studies have potential repercussions and value far beyond the boundaries of the Middle Ages. These chapters are powerful demonstrations of the value of medieval research to our own times, both in terms of providing answers to some of the specific questions facing humanity today and in terms of much broader considerations. Taken together, the research presented here also provides readers with confidence in the fact that Medieval Studies cannot be neglected without a great loss to the understanding of what it means to be human. <>

**Tang Junyi: Confucian Philosophy and the Challenge of Modernity** by Thomas Fröhlich [Modern Chinese Philosophy, Brill, 9789004330146]

Tang Junyi's modern Confucianism ranks among the most ambitious philosophical projects in 20th century China. In **Tang Junyi: Confucian Philosophy and the Challenge of Modernity**, Thomas Fröhlich examines Tang Junyi's intellectual reaction to a time of cataclysmic change marked by two Chinese revolutions (1911 and 1949), two world wars, the Cold War period, rapid modernization in East Asia, and the experience of exile.

The present study fundamentally questions widespread interpretations that depict modern Confucianism as essentially traditionalist and nationalistic. Thomas Fröhlich shows that Tang Junyi actually challenges such interpretations with an insightful understanding of the modern individual's vulnerability, as well as a groundbreaking reinterpretation of Confucianism as the civil-theological foundation for liberal democracy in China. <>

**The Green Sea of Heaven: Fifty ghazals from the Díwán of Háfiz** translated by Elizabeth T. Gray, Jr. with an Introduction by Daryush Shayegan [Library of Persian: Text and Contexts in Persian Religions and Spirituality, White Cloud Press, 9781883991067]

Hafiz is the preeminent poet of Persian Sufism and one of the great poets of world literature. **The Green Sea of Heaven: Fifty ghazals from the Díwán of Háfiz** is regarded as the finest English translation of his poetry. Elizabeth Gray's translations are informed by her thorough knowledge of Persian and the Persian poetic tradition. (Many recent books attributed to Hafiz have been produced by persons who do not know Persian at all!) This bilingual edition also includes two brilliant studies of Hafiz by Gray and Daryush Shayegan, plus helpful notes to the translation.

Khwāja Shams ud-Dīn Muhammad Hafiz -i Shírází (d. 1389) is acknowledged to be the unrivalled master of the classical Persian ghazal, a brief and strict lyric form. Throughout the Persian-speaking world one hears his verses recited or sung in the bazaar, on the radio, and at spiritual gatherings. His Díwán, or

collected works, is held in such high esteem that, like the Qur'án, it is used for divination and augury. Nevertheless, about Háfiz's life we have legends but few facts. We do not even have an authentic text of his Diwán. <>

**Light upon Light: Essays in Islamic Thought and History in Honor of Gerhard Bowering**  
edited by Jamal J. Elias, Bilal Orfali [Islamic History and Civilization, Brill, 9789004409941]

**Light upon Light: Essays in Islamic Thought and History in Honor of Gerhard Bowering**  
brings together studies that explore the richness of Islamic intellectual life in the pre-modern period. Leading scholars around the world present nineteen studies that explore diverse areas of Islamic Studies, in honor of a renowned scholar and teacher: Professor Dr. Gerhard Bowering (Yale University). The volume includes contributions in four main areas: (1) Quran and Early Islam; (2) Sufism, Shi'ism, and Esotericism; (3) Philosophy; (4) Literature and Culture. These areas reflect the enormous breadth of Professor Bowering's contributions to the field over a lifetime of scholarship, teaching, and mentoring. <>

**Reimagining Spirit: Wind, Breath, and Vibration** by Grace Ji-Sun Kim [Cascade Books, 9781532689253]

The Spirit presents itself to many as an enigma. Its existence is mysterious and complex, generating misunderstandings and unawareness of its true purpose. The Spirit's ambiguous nature opens the opportunity for study to unearth the exciting truths that it holds. The Spirit is present in our world in various forms. This book aims to examine the Spirit as experienced in light, wind, breath, and vibration to help us uncover some of its aspects that invite us to work for climate justice, racial justice, and gender justice. The Holy Spirit has always been a mover and shaker of ideas and action. The Spirit's presence moves, stirs, and changes us to become aware of the social ills in our world. <>

**Goethe's Faust and the Divan of Hafiz: Body and Soul in Pursuit of Knowledge and Beauty** by Hiwa Michaeli [De Gruyter, 9783110661569] [open source](#)

This book explores the poetic articulations of a shift from a transcendent to an immanent worldview, as reflected in the manner of evaluation of body and soul in Goethe's Faust and Hāfiz' Divan. Focusing on two lifeworks that illustrate their authors' respective intellectual histories, this cross-genre study goes beyond the textual confines of the two poets' Divans to compare important building blocks of their intellectual worlds. <>

**Exercise of Power: American Failures, Successes, and a New Path Forward in the Post-Cold War World** by Robert M. Gates. [Alfred A. Knopf, 9781524731885] Other titles: **America and the Post-Cold War World**

From the former secretary of defense and author of the acclaimed #1 best-selling memoir, Duty, a candid, sweeping examination of power in all its manifestations, and how it has been exercised, for good and bad, by American presidents in the post-Cold War world.

Since the end of the Cold War, the global perception of the United States has progressively morphed from dominant international leader to disorganized entity, seemingly unwilling to accept the mantle of leadership or unable to govern itself effectively. Robert Gates argues that this transformation is the result of the failure of political leaders to understand the complexity of American power, its expansiveness, and its limitations. He makes clear that the successful exercise of power is not limited to the use of military might or the ability to coerce or demand submission, but must encompass as well diplomacy, economics, strategic communications, development assistance, intelligence, technology, ideology, and cyber. By analyzing specific challenges faced by the American government in the post-Cold War period--Iran, Iraq, Afghanistan, North Korea, Syria, Libya, Russia, China, and others--Gates deconstructs the ways in which leaders have used the instruments of power available to them. With



forthright judgments of the performance of past presidents and their senior-most advisers, firsthand knowledge, and insider stories, Gates argues that U.S. national security in the future will require learning, and abiding by, the lessons of the past, and re-creating those capabilities that the misuse of power has cost the nation. <>

**Shakespeare and Protestant Poetics** by Jason Gleckman [Palgrave Macmillan, 9789813295988]

This book explores the impact of the sixteenth-century Reformation on the plays of William Shakespeare. Taking three fundamental Protestant concerns of the era – (double) predestination, conversion, and free will – it demonstrates how Protestant theologians, in England and elsewhere, re-imagined these longstanding Christian concepts from a specifically Protestant perspective. Shakespeare utilizes these insights to generate his distinctive view of human nature and the relationship between humans and God. Through in-depth readings of the Shakespeare comedies ‘The Merry Wives of Windsor’, ‘Much Ado About Nothing’, ‘A Midsummer Night’s Dream’, and ‘Twelfth Night’, the romance ‘A Winter’s Tale’, and the tragedies of ‘Macbeth’ and ‘Hamlet’, this book examines the results of almost a century of Protestant thought upon literary art.

**Explaining the Cosmos: Creation and Cultural Interaction in Late-Antique Gaza** by Michael W. Champion [Oxford Studies in Late Antiquity, Oxford University Press, 9780199337484]

**Explaining the Cosmos: Creation and Cultural Interaction in Late-Antique Gaza** analyzes the writings of three thinkers associated with Gaza: Aeneas, Zacharias and Procopius. Together, they offer a case study for the appropriation, adaptation, and transformation of classical philosophy in late antiquity, and for cultural transitions more generally in Gaza. Aeneas claimed that the "Academy and Lyceum" had been transferred to Gaza. This book asks what the cultural and intellectual characteristics of the Gazan "Academies" were, and how members of the schools mixed with local cultures of Christians, philosophers, rhetoricians and monks from the local monasteries.

Aeneas, Zacharias and Procopius each contributed to debates about the creation and eternity of the world, which ran from the Neoplatonist Proclus into the sixth-century disputes between Philoponus, Simplicius and Cosmas Indicopleustes. The Gazan contribution is significant in its own right, highlighting distinctive aspects of late-antique Christianity, and it throws the later philosophical debates into sharper relief. Focusing on the creation debates also allows for exploration of the local cultures that constituted Gazan society in the late-fifth and early-sixth centuries. *Explaining the Cosmos* further explores cultural dynamics in the Gazan schools and monasteries and the wider cultural history of the city. The Gazans adapt and transform aspects of Classical and Neoplatonic culture while rejecting Neoplatonic religious claims. The study also analyses the Gazans' intellectual contributions in the context of Neoplatonism and early Christianity. The Gaza which emerges from this study is a set of cultures in transition, mutually constituting and transforming each other through a fugal pattern of exchange, adaptation, conflict and collaboration. <>