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"I built a tower of my poetry
That neither wind nor rain shall ever harm.
The seeds of words I have scattered thus
Shall make my name immortal after all."
-Ferdowsi-

I dedicate this humble work to Ferdowsi
whose words have immortal wisdom and beauty.
NOTE ON THE TRANSLITERATION OF THE IRANIAN NAMES

One point which may raise a question in this paper is the inconsistency in the spelling of Iranian names. This inconsistency is due to the fact that no two Western authors whom I refer to have transliterated the Iranian names in the same way. Since Western authors are, in general, unfamiliar with Iranian names, some of the transliterations which resulted sound quite unIranian. Therefore, for the purpose of this paper I have used my own system of transliteration based on the "Merriam Webster Pronunciation Symbols" of the Webster Seventh New Collegiate Dictionary, except in cases where I have had to quote directly from the authors. I have, for example, used "Rostam," which I believe reflects more closely the Iranian pronunciation of that name, instead of Arnold's "Rustum," Atkinson's "Rustem," Malcolm's "Roostum," or Sainte-Beuve's "Roustem."
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

As is already known, the story in Matthew Arnold's *Sohrab and Rustum* is, with some modification, borrowed from the great Iranian epic *Shahnameh* (1010-11) by Abolqasem-e Ferdowsi, one of the most celebrated poets of the Iranian Renaissance.¹ *Shahnameh*, aside from being a great literary work and aside from its mythical and historical significance, has for centuries been a great spur to Iranian nationalism; and some of its episodes, particularly those related to Rostam, Iran's greatest legendary hero, have been among the most popular in Iranian folklore.² Because of the popularity of *Shahnameh* among Iranians, it is quite natural for Iranian readers of English literature to read Matthew Arnold's *Sohrab and Rustum* more or less in the light of the original story, and it is not likely that they will be convinced by Arnold's claim—published as a note in the second edition of his poems (1854)—or by the conviction of Western critics, that the English poet did not use a translation of Ferdowsi's work but only consulted second hand sources, namely Sir John Malcolm's *History of Persia* and the summary of the story as told by Sainte-Beuve in
Causeries du Lundi (1850). For Iranian readers of Arnold's poem, it is easy to see that Sir John Malcolm's note on Sohrab's story and Sainte-Beuve's summary of the story could not have supplied Arnold with as many details of the story as his poem contains (See Mal.'s Hist., I, 27-28n). On the other hand, it is not difficult for them to see Arnold's contribution to Ferdowsi's story and the points which make his poem significantly different from the original.

As an Iranian who has read the original story of Sohrab and Rostam many times in the context of Shahnameh and not merely as a single poem treated freely by Matthew Arnold, I expect to study Arnold's Sohrab and Rustum with a different approach and from a different point of view than those of the Western critics who have dealt with the poem. I expect to show that Arnold has used the Rev. James Atkinson's Shah Nameh as the main source for the story, for although the principal part of Ferdowsi's story is repeated by Malcolm, and by Sainte-Beuve, as well as by Atkinson, what Arnold has drawn from Malcolm's History and from Sainte-Beuve's summary of the story is meager compared to his borrowings from Atkinson's translation. Arnold has drawn from both the abridged story of Sohrab, as told by Atkinson in prose, and from the complete story as translated by Atkinson.

This is not to say that there is nothing unique about Arnold's poem. By borrowing materials from other
sources, by using his own imagination, and by introducing new techniques he has developed a new poem which, from the point of view of those who are not familiar with the background of the Iranian myth and its personages, might be considered more pleasant reading than the original. Also he has developed a poem which, from the standpoint of Western aesthetic values is distinctly different from Ferdowsi's work. In this paper I expect to show both Arnold's use of Atkinson's translation and Arnold's own innovations. In addition, I shall raise the following questions which I hope to answer: First, what has caused the critics to ignore James Atkinson as one of the contributors to Matthew Arnold's poem? Second, are there any similarities between Arnold's and Atkinson's works which could justify a revaluation of the part played by Atkinson in Arnold's work? If, so what are the techniques used by the English poet in developing his poem that have obscured his direct borrowings from another English work? Third, if Arnold did use a translation of Ferdowsi as his source, did he contribute anything to justify a claim of authorship, and if so what are the major differences between Arnold's Sohrab and Rustum and the original story?
CHAPTER II

MATTHEW ARNOLD'S SOURCES AND THE CRITICS' OPINION

The question of Arnold's sources for Sohrab and Rustum is almost as old as the poem itself. As Tinker and Lowry have suggested, Arnold probably would have kept silent about his sources if his friends had not raised questions (The Poetry of M.A., p. 82). But, apparently, they did, and Arnold was compelled to acknowledge his indebtedness to Malcolm's History and Sainte-Beuve's article (See A.'s note). We have no reason to believe that had Atkinson been living, Arnold would not have acknowledged his indebtedness to him (Atkinson died in 1852). However, no question about Atkinson's translation arose in Arnold's lifetime, and Arnold was probably certain that his note of explanation in his edition of 1854 Poems would satisfy his readers' curiosity. A glance at Arnold's correspondence and notes, however, reveals discrepancies which suggest that he was not so much trying to hide Sainte-Beuve as his major source as that he preferred to remain silent about another source.

When the poem was finished in May, 1853, he wrote a letter to his friend Arthur H. Clough and one to his mother, in both of which he expressed the extent of his satisfaction with the new work, considering it the best
thing he had done. In the letter to Clough he remarked: "... however in this case the material was a thoroughly good one, ..." (Letters to Clough). In the letter to his mother he remarked, "... but then the story is a very noble and excellent one" (Letters, I). When the poem was published for the first time in the edition of his 1853 Poems, no indebtedness for the sources of the story was acknowledged. The poem appeared to have been written with the purpose of supporting the theory of poetry set forth in the Preface. Shortly after the poem was published, however, Arnold's friends began to question him about his Miltonic and Tennysonian imitations in Sohrab and Rustum. Then, to convince Coleridge and his other friends that he had not been imitating Tennyson's Morte d'Arthur, Arnold wrote to Clough on November 25, 1853, confessing: "I think the likeness, where there is likeness, ... proceeds from our both having imitated Homer" (Letters to Clough; see also the letter dated November 30, 1853). On January 6, 1854, eight months after the completion of the poem, Arnold, who probably anticipated trouble, sent a personal note of acknowledgement to Sainte-Beuve, together with a collection of his poems. The letter reads in part:

En vous les envoyant je ne fais que vous restituer ce que je vous ai pris; puisque c'est dans une de vos charmantes causeries que j'ai trouvé des renseignements sur l'épisode de la mort de Sohrab, qui m'ont
donné' le courage de commencer enfin mon poème. J'en avais lu une notice très courte dans une note de l'histoire de Perse de Sir John Malcolm; et je concus alors le dessein de le mettre en vers; mais je me vis aussitôt forcé d'y renoncer, faute de détails nécessaires que je ne réussis à apprendre que plus tard, et en lisant votre article. Mon poème principal, don, Monsieur, ... (Bonnerot, p. 518).

In this letter, Arnold's regret that he did not have Sainte-Beuve's article in time to supply him with the "necessary details" seems to have been a mere gesture of courtesy to excuse himself for the drastic departures in the poem from Sainte-Beuve's summary. For if, as the note suggests, the poet had time to compose his "poem principal" from Sainte-Beuve's article, he probably also had time to correct such minor yet correctable errors in the poem as the birthplace of Sohrab, which he indicates as Ader-baijan instead of Samangan, which Sainte-Beuve uses in his article. The question is whether Sainte-Beuve's article contains as many details from the original story as Arnold's poem contains.

At any rate, Arnold's anticipation of trouble was timely, for not long after he wrote Sainte-Beuve, he was accused by the inquisitive J.D. Coleridge in the Christian Remembrancer (1854) xxvii, 310-33, of having used Sainte-Beuve's review of Jules Mohl's translation of Sohrab's story in Causeries du Lundi (1850) without proper acknowledgment of the French author. This public attack by Coleridge seems to have been quite unexpected for Arnold.
We can guess this from the postscript of his letter to Wyndham Slade, dated August 3, 1854: "My love to J.D.C., and tell him that the limited circulation of the Christian Remembrancer makes the unquestionable viciousness of his article of little importance. I am sure he will be gratified to think that it is so" (Letters, I). But Arnold knew too well that Coleridge's article would have an effect on his reputation, and the immediate publication of the second edition of his poems in 1854, including the popular note, suggests an attempt to defend his integrity rather than to acknowledge his sources; for even then Arnold was not accurate in quoting his sources (This is also noticed by Tinker and Lowry). For example, in quoting Malcolm's note on Sohrab's episode, Arnold has left out one line from the middle, in which the names of two of Ferdowsi's characters appear—two characters whose names Arnold has used in his poem: "Gudurz and Zoarrah" (170, 174, etc.). His paraphrasing of the first part of Sainte-Beuve's summary, in which Sainte-Beuve has summarized Rostam's marriage with Sohrab's mother, is carelessly done, (S.B. pp. 344-345), and he has left out Ferdowsi's theme which Sainte-Beuve has quoted from Mohl's translation at the end of his summary as follows:

'Le souffle de la mort, dit-il, est comme un feu dévorant: il n'épargne ni la jeunesse ni la vieillesse. Pourquoi donc les jeunes gens se réjouiraient-ils, puisque la vieillesse n'est pas la seule cause de la mort? Il faut
partir, et sans tarder, quand la mort pousse le cheval de la destinée! (p. 350; see Ferdowski's theme as translated by Atkinson p. 72 below).

In addition, Arnold has mentioned nothing of the extent to which he has drawn from Malcolm's *History*. We might add, also, that he has failed to mention where his ideas for the oriental coloring in his poem were derived from. However, I believe his failure, in the latter case, is a commonly accepted practice since what he drew from Sir Alexander Burnes's *Travels into Bokhara* for his oriental coloring and for his landscape could have been drawn from other travel books about Iran and Central Asia by other authors (e.g. Sir John Malcolm's *Sketches of Persia*, 1827). When, however, he comes in the note to defend himself, he explicitly regrets that, "Of M. Mohl's book itself [he] had not been able to obtain sight." Explicitly, he regrets that he "could not meet with a translation from Ferdousi's poem of the whole of the episode of Sohrab and Rustum; with a prose translation, that is: for in a verse translation no original work is any longer recognizable. I should certainly have made all the use I could of it" (See A.'s note).

By looking closely at Arnold's note, one can clearly see that by building up a logical argument he has tried to clear up any suspicion which might give rise to the question of his having used the English translations which
were available at the time, particularly Atkinson's translations which consisted of both an abridged version of the story, in prose, and "the whole of the episode" in verse.6

Arnold writes in his note, and to some extent it is true, "The reader is not . . . concerned to ask, from what sources [the details of a work] have been drawn; but only how the whole work, as it stands, affects him." Yet authorities on Arnold have been so meticulous in noting down his sources that they have not overlooked such insignificant and even doubtful sources as Eugene Flandis's article on the ruins of Persepolis in the Revue des Deux Mondes (n.p. vii (1850) 114-141, 413-433) for Arnold's simile of the "black granite pillars" in lines 860-861. (See for comments Tinker and Lowry The Poetry of M.A., p. 76; Bonnerot; 518-519n.; and Allott The Poems of M.A., 329-330n.). How, then, could the critics overlook James Atkinson as at least one of the contributors, if not the major one?

The reasons for ignoring Atkinson as a possible source for Arnold's poem, as I see them, are: First, the unfamiliarity of most Western critics with Iranian myths and literature. The simplest example of this is their failure to notice that, in his note to the second edition, Arnold has misquoted the name of Sohrab's mother. Although Sainte-Beuve has spelled her name "Tehmimeh" in his
article, Arnold in his note of acknowledgement writes "Tehmineh." This error suggests that Arnold's mind was preoccupied with another spelling of the name (Atkinson spells her name "Tahmineh."), particularly since Arnold's error appears in the consonant and not the vowel (See S.B.'s spelling p. 345. Cp. with A.'s note in Allott's The Poems of M.A., p. 613). For other examples of the Western critics unfamiliarity with the Iranian myth, see the notes.7

Second, and probably the main reason, is the difficulty in comparing Arnold's poem with Atkinson's prose and verse versions of the story, mainly because of the differences of structure of Arnold's poem and Atkinson's translation. Besides, due to the many borrowings in Arnold's poem from other episodes of Shahnameh (other than the story of Sohrab),8 from Homer's Iliad, and from Burnes's Travels, Arnold's poem has a completely different texture. Furthermore, even in what Arnold has taken from Shahnameh, either from Malcolm, from Sainte-Beuve, or as I hope to show, from Atkinson's versions, he has made many changes in time, place, and action. He has replaced the personages of the story with new ones and has changed their roles, and he has introduced many metaphors and similes which, though based on the ideas of the original story, are not found there. The result is that a satisfactory comparative study of Arnold's work with Atkinson's translation is rather
difficult unless the student is so familiar with the original story that when reading Arnold's poem he can recollect where to look for the translated lines.

Third, and less important but still important enough to convince the critics that Arnold had not used Atkinson's translation is, I should say, the unsatisfactory comparative study done by Professor Louise Pound (in Modern Language Notes (1906) xxi, 15-17).

In her comparison of Arnold's poem with Malcolm's History and Atkinson's translation, Pound rejects Atkinson as a source on such minor grounds as the spelling of the proper names, although she must admit that Arnold is inconsistent. She argues that in Arnold's poem, as in Malcolm's History, Afrasiyab is the Tartar King, whereas in Atkinson he is the King of the Turanians. In this argument, she ignores the fact that Atkinson uses both terms, Tartar and Turanian, interchangeably (See Atk. pp. 178, 182, 183, 184, and etc.). Malcolm also notes: "Turan of Scythia to its farthest bounds, was under Afrasiab; ... " [I, 33n.]). She calls the reader's attention to the fact that Arnold, like Malcolm, has not mentioned the name of Sohrab's mother, as if that were important. She speaks as if the Jâhun and the Oxus were two different rivers instead of one. She suggests that "the Oxus region stands out clearly in Malcolm's chapters as the frontier region defended by Rustum against the invading Tartars," whereas
in Atkinson's translation "Sohrab is represented as in a fortress, Rustum arriving before." But in so doing, she is comparing "Malcolm's chapters," which contain the whole history of the legendary period, with one episode in Atkinson's translation. Had she compared Arnold's poem with other episodes in Atkinson's translation belonging to the same period, she would have seen that in Atkinson, too, the Jähun was the frontier. She notes, also, that in Arnold's poem as in Malcolm's note, the sign of Sohrab's identity is "a seal" whereas in Atkinson it is an "amulet" or a "golden bracelet" (See the notes for Sohrab's identity). When, however, she notices a few similarities, she considers them either "fortuitous" or "Homerica and biblical."

On the basis of her study, since 1906 Arnold's critics and editors have discarded Atkinson, forever, from the circle of contributors to Arnold's poem (Tinker and Lowry's The Poetry of M.A. p. 77; Bonnerot, 398n). Thus, in 1940 Tinker and Lowry dismiss the question of Arnold's indebtedness by writing, "Of that body of myth Arnold knew too little" (p. 75). "He felt the grandeur of the great Persian myth but could not bring himself to the weary task of going through Malcolm's Persia or of reading Ferdowsi's poem in translation. He feared to lose the impulse which he had received" (p. 85). The fact is that Malcolm's History contains so little of the legendary Iran that its reading takes less than one hour, and of Sohrab's story,
except for a short footnote, most of which Arnold has quoted, there is no more in Malcolm's book. Whether Arnold had the patience to read Ferdowsi's poem in translation or not is a question that this paper will try to answer.
CHAPTER III

A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF SOHRAB AND RUSTUM AND ITS SOURCES

In the following study of Arnold's Sohrab and Rustum and its sources, since my primary concern is to show that Arnold has used a translation of Shahnameh, I will disregard Homer and Burnes unless their works are related to Atkinson's translation. I will also leave out passages that Malcolm and/or Sainte-Beuve and Atkinson have in common unless there is an indication that only one of the three sources has been drawn from. In the process of this comparative study, I will note the similarities and differences in the details of Arnold's poem and Atkinson's translation of Ferdowsi, but since a detailed study of this kind requires constant reference to Arnold's text and his sources, I will quote as many lines from Arnold's sources as are needed to help us understand Arnold's borrowings. For long passages, or unimportant references, I will note down only the page number of the source. For references to Arnold's poem, I would like to suggest Mr. Kenneth Allott's The Poems of Matthew Arnold (1965), which contains all the data related to the poem and its sources as footnotes. As I proceed to examine Arnold's poem,
stage by stage, I will relate Ferdowsi's story wherever a clarification of this kind is needed to help the reader see how ingeniously Arnold has reworked the story of Sohrab and Rostam. Moreover, I will also show why it has been almost impossible to make a parallel study of Arnold's work and Atkinson's translation.

Stage I. Arnold's poem, lines 1-30 in which Sohrab leaves his tent to visit Pūran-e Vās, the Tartar chieftain:

In the original story of Sohrab and Rostam, as translated by Atkinson, after the opening passage which explains the poem's theme (See p. 72 below for Atkinson's translation of Ferdowsi's theme. Cp. with Sainte-Beuve's quotation from Mohl on page 7 above), the reader meets Rostam on a hunting expedition near the city of Samangan, sees his marriage with Sohrab's mother and his departure from Samangan on the following morning, where he leaves his wife with his own armband as an identification for their child, if they should have one. Then the story proceeds with Sohrab's quest for his father, leads Sohrab into becoming the tool of Afrasiyab's plot, and ends in Sohrab's conquest of the strongest fort on the borderline of Turan and Iran along the Oxus (Jāhun), and to the imprisonment of Hajēr, the Iranian commander of the fort (Sainte-Beuve mentions Hajēr only as "le prisonnier"). Arnold begins his story at the point where Ferdowsi describes—
the first morning of the battle between the father and the son (Atk. pp. 178-193, 543-551. See also Sainte-Beuve's pp. 344-347). Since the opening lines in Arnold's poem reflect the content of Ferdowsi's story of the first day of the campaign, let us see from what sources Arnold drew his materials.

If Arnold's sole source had been Sainte-Beuve's essay (Malcolm does not describe details of this kind), we might expect the opening lines of his poem to reflect the picture Sainte-Beuve draws in the following lines:

Le jeune Sohrab, de son côté, quand vient le matin, en présence de cette armée dont le camp se déplie devant lui, est avide de savoir si son noble père n'en est pas. Monté sur un lieu élevé, il se fait nommer par un prisonnier tous les chefs illustres dont il voit se dérouler les étendards (p. 347)

But the opening lines of Arnold's poem are much more reminiscent of the following passage from Atkinson's translation:

When now the sun his golden buckler raised,
And genial light through heaven diffusive blazed,
Sohrab in mail his nervous limbs attired,
For dreadful wrath his soul to vengeance fired;
With anxious haste he bent the yielding cord,
Ring within ring, more fateful than the sword;
Around his brows a regal helm he bound;
His dappled steed impatient stamp'd the ground.
Thus armed, ascending where the eye could trace
The hostile force, and mark each leader's place,
He called Hújir, the captive Chief addressed,
And anxious thus, his soul's desire expressed:
(AtK. p. 580, 3-14)

Here, as in Arnold's poem, we have a picture of Sohrab dressing on the morning of the battle. But for his picture
of Sohrab, Arnold has obviously turned from Atkinson to
the opening passage of the *Iliad* II, in which Homer says that
all the "gods" and "warriors of the plain slept soundly,
but Jove was wakeful, for he was thinking how to do honour
to Achilles, . . . " Arnold's Sohrab, like Jove, has not
slept "all night long" and "had lain wakeful, tossing on
his bed . . . " (Samuel Butler's tr. *Iliad*).

Continuing in lines 11 through 82, Arnold still seems
to follow a different design from Ferdowsi's. The above
quotations from Sainte-Beuve and Atkinson tell that Sohrab
ascended to a high place and called a prisoner whom
Atkinson names as Hajër. In Arnold's poem, on the other
hand, Sohrab leaves his quarters, he mounts with Hajër,
the prisoner, to the top of the fort, and pointing to the
colorful tents of the Iranian warriors, anxiously questions
Hajër in order to find his father's tent among the Iranian
tents which are pitched some distance from the fort (The
fort was built along the Oxus, the borderline between Iran
and Turan). Hajër, however, who has no intention of
identifying Rostam's tents, pretends that Rostam is not
among the warriors (Atk. pp. 191-193; 580-585). In Arnold's
poem, basically the same thing happens but in a different
way. After Sohrab leaves his tent early in the morning,
he passes through the "black Tartar tents" and mounts over
a "hillock" where, in "former times," its "top" had been
"crowned" "with a clay-fort; but that was fallen, and
now/The Tartars built there Peran-Wisa's tent" (11-12). Sohrab asks Peran-e Vās's counsel and learns from him that his father is not among the Iranian host (38-78, 81-85. Cp. with Hājēr's answer in Atk. p. 585, 15-18). Hence, by changing the place and personages involved, Arnold has created a different scene—one which makes the identification of his source rather complicated. For in Arnold's poem, the "hillock" stands for the top of the "fortress" in Atkinson's translation; and Peran-e Vās is partly Hājēr whom Sohrab anxiously question about his father. In the above passages it is interesting to note that Peran-e Vās is described by Arnold like Agamemnon in the Iliad II when Agamemnon leaves his tent, with the difference that Peran-e Vās has a Turkaman "sheep-skin" cap.

Stage II. See Arnold's poem lines 31-169: Sohrab's discourse with Peran-e Vās and Peran's proposal of a truce on the first day of the battle:

As can be inferred from Arnold's poem, Sohrab visits Peran-e Vās the first thing in the morning and anxiously asks his help in finding his father among the Iranian host. In what follows, Arnold's poem appears to be quite different from Atkinson's translation. For one thing, Peran-e Vās, who is a prominent Turan character in Shahnameh, has no role in the original story of Sohrab and Rostam. Arnold has employed this character from another story of Shahnameh called the story of Siyawush
and has made him play many parts. Not only has Arnold integrated the part which Fēran plays in Siyawush's story into Sohrab's story, he has also used him, as I mentioned earlier, to act for Hajēr. At another time, Arnold uses him in place of Sohrab's mother, and once he even speaks for Rostam. Such synthesis naturally makes Arnold's poem too complicated for a detailed comparison with Ferdowsi's, but after one begins to see how Arnold has compressed, condensed, and combined, it becomes quite challenging to find not only that Arnold has used a translation, but how he has used it. In the following paragraph, I shall try to indicate something of his technique in substituting the characters.

In lines 38-73 of Arnold's poem, it is clear that Afrasiyab loves Sohrab as if he were his own son. In these lines, also, Fēran asks Sohrab to sojourn with them. Nothing of this occurs in Ferdowsi's story of Sohrab and Rostam. There, Afrasiyab does not favor Sohrab; on the contrary, he plots against Sohrab and his father to have one of them kill the other. To further the plot, he appoints Human and Baraman as commanders in Sohrab's army and asks them not to reveal Rostam's identity to his son (Atk. p. 183, 555). According to Ferdowsi, the only Iranian prince who was ever sincerely favored by the Turan monarch was Siyawush—a character who never appears in Arnold's poem. He does, however, figure in Malcolm's
History and is, of course, the hero of the Story of Siyawush (I, 29-31), that poem by Ferdowski which Atkinson has also translated in an abridged version in prose. What Arnold has done is borrow this part of Siyawush's story from either the History or Atkinson's translation and adapt it to his poem, substituting Sohrab for Siyawush. The question is, from whom did he borrow—Malcolm or Atkinson?

In Malcolm's History there is nothing that told Arnold how Siyawush was persuaded to stay with the Tartars and who persuaded him. In Atkinson's translation there is. There, Peran says to Siyawush: "Young prince, thou art now high in the favour of the king, and at a great distance from Persia, and thy father is old; would it not therefore be better for thee to marry and take up thy residence among us for life" (Atk. pp. 225-226)? In Arnold's poem, too, lines 65-72, we find Peran-e Vas persuading Sohrab to remain with the Tartars:

"O Sohrab, an unquiet heart is thine!
Canst thou not rest among the Tartar Chiefs
And share the battle's common chance with us
Who love thee, but must press for ever first,
In single fight incurring single risk,
To find a father thou hast never seen?
That were far best, my son to stay with us
Unmurmuring; . . ."

Unless poetic genius, or, again, "fortuitous" coincidence dictated Arnold's choice of thought and character, we must assume that he was inspired by Atkinson.
In lines 79-80 of Arnold's poem, Pēran-e Vās speaks of his own youth: "For now it is not as when I was young./When Rustum was in front of every fray; . . ." In Malcolm's History there is nothing about Rostam and Pēran in their youth, and Pēran appears in the History only in his old age after the story of Sohrab has already been related. Although it is not impossible that Arnold could have imagined Pēran and Rostam against each other in their youth, such lines do suggest that Arnold learned from Atkinson's translation that these two warriors had stood against each other in their youth (e.g. Atk. pp. 126-132).

In the above passage we have seen both how Arnold has integrated part of the story of Siyawush into the story of Sohrab and how he has woven the role played by Pēran-e Vās in other stories into the framework of his poem. By examining lines 49-50, 45-53, and 54-59 of the poem and by comparing them with possible sources of inspiration, we may see how Arnold has made use of Pēran in other ways.

In lines 49-53, Sohrab opens his heart to Pēran-e Vās and tells him of his wishes:

"I seek one man, one man, and one alone—Rustum, my father; who I hoped should greet, Should one day greet, upon some well-fought field, His not unworthy, not inglorious son."

and Pēran answers, in line 75: "'To seek out Rustum—seek him not through fight!'" In Sohrab's story the only
person to whom Sohrab confided his desire to seek his father was Tahmineh, his mother. Malcolm's *History* has no details of this part of the episode, but Sainte-Beuve's summary has a few lines from which Arnold could have drawn his lines on Sohrab's desire to seek his father:

> L'enfant, sentant sa force, alla fièrement demander à sa mère le nom de son père, et quand il le sut, il n'eut plus de cesse qu'il n'eut assemblé une armée pour aller combattre les Iraniens et se faire reconnaître du glorieux Roustem à ses exploits et sa bravoure (p. 346).

However, from Sainte-Beuve's summary Arnold could learn only about Sohrab's desire and not of his mother's reaction unless, again, coincidence dictated that Arnold's lines be similar to Atkinson's. In Atkinson's version, when Sohrab speaks of his intention to his mother, Tahmineh remarks,

> Nor ask the harvest of renown to reap; For when, by this peculiar signet known, Thy glorious father shall demand his son, Seek not the fame which only teems with woe; (Atk. p. 553, 1-7)

and Sohrab answers firmly, "'O mother, I must now/My father seek, and see his lofty brow!" (Atk. p. 554, 1. See also prose 182-183).

Later, in lines 54-59 of Arnold's poem, Sohrab asks Þeran-e Vās to grant him permission to "'challenge forth the bravest Persian Lords/To meet [them] man to man; . . .!" Only from Atkinson's translation could Arnold have learned that Sohrab challenged the Iranian lords, though in Atkinson's translation no permission is sought; Sohrab simply
rushes forth and challenges the Iranian lords by name and finally asks for Rostam:

"Whom canst thou send to try the desperate strife?"
"What valiant Chief, regardless, of his life?"
"Where now can Fraburz, Tūs, Giw, Gūdarz, be."
"And the world-conquering Rustem, where is he?"

(Atk. p. 588, 13-16).

In Arnold's poem, the introduction of Pēran as a foil for Sohrab may serve a dramatic purpose, but it does not alter the fact that Arnold's lines seem to have been inspired by Atkinson.

In reviewing the passage beginning with line 38 and ending with line 103, I mentioned above that in Arnold's poem Sohrab, instead of meeting with Hajēr, meets with Pēran-e Vās and learns from him that his father is not among the Iranian host. In the original story, the answer which Hajēr gives is, as Sainte-Beuve writes (and Atkinson has exactly the same idea in his verse translation):

"'Sans doute, réplique celui-ci, le héros sera allé dans le Zaboulistan, car c'est le temps de fêtes dans les jardins de roses!'" (347. Cp. with Atk. p. 585, 15-18). In Arnold's poem, lines 81-85, the answer which Pēran gives conveys the same idea that Sainte-Beuve's lines convey, but a new note is introduced:

"But now Rostam keeps apart, and sits at home,
In Seistan, with Zal, his father old.
Whether that his own mighty strength at last
Feels the abhorred approaches of old age,
Or in some quarrel with the Persian King."
We can see clearly that Sainte-Beuve's summary does not contain the idea of Rostam's quarrel with the Persian King. On the other hand, in Atkinson's translation of Ferdowsi's Sohrab and Rostam, there are many references to a misunderstanding between the King and Rostam (Atk. pp. 187-189; 569-572). In these passages Rostam feels such strong indignation at the behavior of Kawus that he deserts the court and attempts to return to Sestan, but he is prevented from doing so by Gudarz. See p.32 below.)

Beginning with line 104, Arnold describes the time as still being morning. Only, "The sun by this time had risen, and cleared the fog," and Human, who was the commander of the Tartar host, orders them to be prepared for the battle (Human, when the story of Sohrab is told, is about the same age as Fēran-e Vās; Arnold describes him as "in his lusty prime."). In lines 110-137, Arnold depicts the Tartar host over the Oxus plains, and in lines 138-140, he depicts the Iranian troops. Apparently this entire passage does not appear in Atkinson's translation, but there is a passage in the translation which seems to have served Arnold as a pattern for his lines 110-140.

To understand how Arnold has reworked Atkinson's translation in the above lines, one must turn in the translation to the morning before the battle begins. There the reader will find a similar scene which begins with the description of the sunrise and then shows the movement of
the Iranian army on the plain (which is, of course, the Oxus plain), while Human and the other Tartar chieftains, horrified, watch the glorious procession of the Iranian army on the mountain brows:

Soon as the Sun had pierced the veil of night,  
And o'er the prospect shed its earliest light,  
Kaus, impatient bids the clarions sound,  
His subjects gathering crowd the mountain's brow,  
And following thousands shade the vales below;  
With shields, in armour, numerous legends bend;  
And troops of horse the threatening lines extend.  
Beneath the tread of heroes fierce and strong,  
By war's tumultuous fury borne along,  
The firm earth shook: the dust, in eddies driven,  
Whirled high in air, obscured the face of heaven;  
Nor earth, nor sky appeared—all, seeming lost,  
And swallowed up by that wide-spreading host.  
The steely armour glitter'd o'er the fields,  
And lightning flash'd from gold emblazoned shields;  
The legions of Turan, with dread surprise,  
Saw o'er the plain successive myriads rise;  
And shewed them to Sohrab; he, mounting high  
The fort, surveyed them with a fearless eye;  
To Human, who, with withering terror pale,  
Had marked their progress through the distant vale,  
He pointed out the sight, and ardent said:—

(Atk. 575-577, see also prose p.190)

(italics mine)

In the above passage by Atkinson, it is by the order of Kaus that the Iranian host "crowd[s]" the mountain's brow, /And following thousands shade the vales below."

In Arnold's poem, it is the Tartar host which, on orders from Haman, "stream" over the "plain" as the "long-necked cranes/ Stream over Casbin and southern slopes of Elburz . . . . "

And where Atkinson pictures the "legions of Turan" watching the "successive myriads [the Iranian army] rise,"
Arnold pictures the spectacular movement of the Turan army for his readers. At the same point in the story, both men briefly describe the opposing army. What is more remarkable, however, is that Arnold's brief description of the Iranian troops so nearly matches Atkinson's description of the same army.

Where, as we see in the long passage quoted above, Atkinson picture the Iranian army:

With shields, in armour, numerous legends bend;  
And troops of horse the threatening lines extend,

Arnold describes:

The royal troops of Persia, horse and foot,  
Marshalled battalions bright in burnished steel

Beginning with line 145 in Arnold's poem, Fārān-e Vās appears as commander-in-chief. After disciplining the Tartar troops, he steps forward between the two hosts and announces to both armies: "'Let there be truce between the hosts today./But choose a champion from the Persian lords/To fight our champion Sohrab, man to man.'"

The effect of his announcement, as Arnold depicts it, is such that the Tartars thrill with joy over hearing Sohrab's name, but "the pale Persians held their breath with fear" (169). In Ferdowsi's story, though no mention is made of the Turanians' joy, the Iranian fear is mentioned, and in his verse translation, Atkinson refers to this fear and adds that after the challenge to single combat had been hurled: "No prompt reply from Persian lip ensued"
(Atk. p. 588, 17). In his prose translation of the story, Atkinson writes in the same connection: "... and such terror had seized upon the hearts of the [Persian] warriors that not a man had courage enough to advance a step against [Sohrab]" (Atk. p. 194). The similarity between Arnold's and Atkinson's description of the Iranians' fear, although Arnold elaborates his description with a simile of the "pedlars, from Cabool," is obvious. In fact, it is only Arnold's introduction of Peran-e Vas into the action at this point that makes the episode so different in his poem from the way it appears in Atkinson's translation of Ferdowsi. For in the original story it is not Peran-e Vas who proposes a truce. Sohrab himself has suggested it once, and finally Rostam consents, saying: "Let there be a truce tonight; but if thou art still for war, oppose thyself to me alone!" (Atk. pp. 196-197. See also p. 592, 39-40)! Rostam's words in Atkinson's translation, we see, are remarkably similar to those spoken by Peran-e Vas in Arnold's poem. Note, though, that Atkinson's "tonight" is changed to Arnold's "today."

Stage III. See Arnold's poem, lines 170-289: Rostam is persuaded by Gudarz to participate in the battle:

In lines 170-289, Arnold describes how the Iranian lords worried over Sohrab's threat and over their hopeless situation since they did not have a champion to match Sohrab. He further describes how Gudarz was able to persuade
Rostam to participate in the battle. This passage of Arnold's represents a long part of Ferdowsi's story, and even though Arnold has condensed the story as translated by Atkinson, his passage contains all the necessary elements of Ferdowsi's plot. In order to show this, I will summarize Ferdowsi's story and will indicate how Arnold in each step has fitted parts of the original story into his own design. Meanwhile, since Malcolm's book contains no details about the preparation for the battle, I will quote the passage in Sainte-Beuve's summary related to this part of the story to show that Arnold surely did not depend on the following lines from Sainte-Beuve when his poem has so much more in common with the original story as translated by Atkinson:

C'est ici que l'action commence à se nouer avec un art et une habileté qui appartiennent au poète. La solution fatale est à la fois entrevue et retardée moyennant des gradations qui vont la rendre plus dramatique. Roustam, mandé en toute hate par le roi effrayé, ne s'empresse point d'accourir. A cette nouvelle d'une armée de Turcs commandée par un jeune homme si vaillant et si héroïque, il a l'idée d'abord que ce pourrait bien être son fils; mais non: ce rejeton de sa race est trop enfant, se dit-il, "et ses lévres sentent encore le lait." Roustam arrive pourtant; mais, mal accueilli par le roi, il entre dans une colère d'Achille, et il est tout prêt à s'en retourner dans sa tente. On ne le fléchit qu'en lui représentant que s'abstenir en une telle rencontre, ce serait paraître reculer devant le jeune héro. Cependant les armées sont en présence. Roustam, déguisé on Turc, s'introduit dans un château qu'occupe l'ennemi, pour juger de tout par lui-même. Il voit son fils assis à un festin: il l'admire, il le compare, pour la force et la beauté, à sa propre race; on dirait, à un moment, que le sang au-dedans va parler et lui crier: C'est lui (pp. 346-347)!
Now, having before us the part of Sainte-Beuve's summary which relates to Arnold's poem, lines 170-289, I will proceed to compare Arnold's poem with Sainte-Beuve's summary and Atkinson's translation.

In Ferdowsi's story, when the news of Sohrab's threat and the surrender of the strong fortress reaches Kawus's court, the alarmed King immediately summons all his lords and discusses with them the danger which threatens Iran with Sohrab's invasion. Thereupon, all the Iranian lords present in the court

With one consent they urge the strong request,
To summon Rustem from his rural rest.--
Instant a warrior-delegate they send,
And thus the King invites his patriot-friend,
The King's message, after the customary greeting reads:

"A youthful Champion leads his ruthless host,
"His savage country's widely-rumoured boast,

                      "Strong as a raging elephant in fight,
"No arm but thine can match his furious might."
(Atk. p. 566, 23-36. See also prose p.186)\(^{14}\)

In comparing these lines with Arnold's, we see that in lines 170-183 Arnold speaks of a small council of Iranian lords, constituted of "Ferood," "Gudurz," "Feraburz," and "Zoarrah," in which they discuss their problem of not having a champion who could match Sohrab. Here Arnold has changed the membership of Ferdowsi's council. Of the men named by Arnold, only Gudarz appears in Ferdowsi's story as a member of the King's council. Ferood is borrowed by Arnold from other episodes of *Shahnameh* to
substitute for one of the members, and Zowareh and Fareborz, who appear in Ferdowsi's story, have no parts here. What concerns us here, however, is that the members of Arnold's council, in lines 176-177, also worry about their situation and say:

"Yet champion have we none to match this youth. He has the wild stag's foot, the lion's heart."

Thus far Sainte-Beuve's summary has played no part in Arnold's poem (Even though Arnold's metaphor of "the lion's heart" could be from Sainte-Beuve, as well as from Atkinson, it does not belong to this part of the story).

In Ferdowsi's story, the person who delivered the King's message to Rostam was Gēv. In Atkinson's verse translation, after Gēv arrives in Zabol (Rostam's home town), Rostam rides out to bid him welcome and do him the usual "honours." Then he asks Gēv: "... what the Monarch, what the state required") of him (Atk. p. 568, 5-8). Gēv delivers the King's letter, and after reading it Rostam, surprised, begins to debate with himself over the content of the letter:

"He bears the port of Rustem too, 'tis said, "Like Sām, like Nūrīman, a warrior bred! "He cannot be my son, unknown to me; "Reason forbid the thought--it cannot be! "At Samengan, where once affection smiled, "To me Tahmineh bore her only child, "That was a daughter?"

He, then, turns to Gēv and says:

"But come, to Nīrum's palace, haste with me, "And there partake the feast--from sorrow free; "Breathe but a while--ere our toils renew,
"And moisten the parched lip with needful dew. "Let plans of war another day decide."
(Atk. p. 568, 15-29. See the prose 187).

In the prose translation, the same account is given, and then Atkinson writes: "Regardless of the summons, Rustem called for wine and music, and made a feast" (Sam and Nūriman are Rostam's grandfather and great grandfather. See Atk. p. 71).

If Arnold's lines 204-231 are carefully examined, we see that they express the same ideas only in a different context: There, when Gudarz runs to Rostam's tent on the day of the battle to summon him to single combat, Rostam:

... greeted Gudurz with both hands, and said:—
"Welcome! these eyes could see no better sight.
"What news? but sit down first, and eat and drink."

Then Gudarz speaks about Sohrab's challenge and about his resemblance to Rostam:

"O Rustum, like thy might is this young man's! He has the wild stag's foot, the lion's heart;"

And as Rostam hears him speak, he regrets having a daughter and not a "son so famed." In Arnold's poem, as in Ferdowsi's story, Rostam welcomes the King's messenger, who is an old friend. In both, he asks about the "news," he invites Gudarz (Gēv) to feast and drink with him, learns through Gudarz (Gēv) about Sohrab's resemblance to himself, and then speaks of his own child. In Sainte-Beuve's summary and in Malcolm's History, the only one of these details
that appears is the last one—that Rostam thought his child was a girl (In Sainte-Beuve's version Rostam knows his child is a boy). In Atkinson's translation, on the other hand, every one of the details is there.

In Ferdowsi's story, after four days of feasting, Gēv is finally able to convince Rostam to leave Zabol for the King's court (Rostam intentionally delays leaving his hometown because Kawus was proud and lacked intuition, and even though Rostam had helped him to the throne, he despised the King.). The King, furious over Rostam's delay, orders Tus, one of his officers, to impale Rostam and Gēv alive. Rostam, with one blow of his fist, casts Tus away and leaves the court for Zabol (See A.'s lines 81-82, 85—Peran's answer to Sohrab when he asks him about his father). The Iranian lords, indignant at the King's behavior, and saddened by this proceeding, gather around Gudarz and ask him to redress the wrong which has been done to Rostam. Gudarz first reminds the King of Rostam's devotion to the Iranian throne and of Kawus's personal indebtedness to Rostam; then he reproaches the King for unwisely impeaching Rostam when Iran needs him most. Thereupon, Kawus asks Gudarz to intervene and prevent Rostam from returning to Zabol. Gudarz and a group of champions overtake Rostam on the road to Sēstan, and being aware of Rostam's pride and his love for Iran, Gudarz warns Rostam of what might befall Iran if at this critical
time he should turn his back on his country (See Atk. pp. 187-189; 569-573). Finally, Gudarz is able to change Rostam's decision. As Atkinson has translated, Gudarz says to Rostam:

"When Rustem dreads Sohrāb's resistless power,  
Well may inferiors fly the trying hour!  
The dire suspicion now pervades us all,  
Thus unavenged shall beauteous Persia fall!  
Yet, generous still, avert the lasting shame,  
'O, still preserve thy country's glorious fame!  
Or will thou, deaf to all our fears excite,  
Forsake thy friends, and shun the pending fight?  
'And worse, O grief! in thy declining days,  
'Forfeit the honours of thy country's praise?"  
(Atk. 575, 3-14) (italics mine)

In Arnold's poem Gudarz persuades Rostam in lines 242-248 as follows:

"What then, O Rustum, will men say to this,  
When Sohrāb dares our bravest forth, and seeks  
Thee most of all, and thou, whom most he seeks  
Hidest thy face? Take heed lest men should say:  
Like some old miser, Rustum hoards his fame,  
And shuns to peril it with younger men."

(italics mine).

In both poems Gudarz persuades Rostam by telling him that if he does not participate in the battle people will say he shunned the danger of fighting. But where in Atkinson's poem Gudarz asks Rostam to be "generous," in Arnold's poem he says, "Take heed lest men should" call you a "miser"--which is another way of saying the same thing.

In Ferdowsi's story, as Atkinson translates it, after Gudarz persuades Rostam,

This artful censure set his soul on fire,  
But patriot firmness calm'd his burning ire;
And thus he said—"Inured to war's alarms, "Did ever Rostam shun the din of arms?"

(Atk. p. 573, 15-18; see also pp. 188-189)

(Arntt's, p. 573, 15-18; see also pp. 188-189)

(italics mine)

Arnold, in his poem, lines 250-259, depicts Rostam's reaction much the same way:

And, greatly moved, then Rustum made reply:—
"O Gudurz, wherefore dost thou say such words?
Thou knowest better words than this to say.
What is one more, one less, obscure or famed,
Valiant or craven, young or old to me?
... . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .
Come, thou shalt see how Rusutm hoards his fame!

Thus, we see, Arnold also speaks of Rostam being so moved by Gudurz's words that he announces his readiness to participate in the battle. Now, after seeing such close similarities between Arnold's and Atkinson's works as we have seen in the above passages, it is difficult to believe that Arnold constructed this part of his poem from the line in Sainte-Beuve's summary which I have quoted above (p. 28 above) and will repeat here for the sake of clarity: "On ne le fléchit qu'en lui représentant que s'abstenir en une telle rencontre, ce serait paraître reculer devant le jeune héros" (p. 347). For one thing, Sainte-Beuve's account in this connection is insufficient and does not contain Rostam's reaction; for another, but more important, Sainte-Beuve has mentioned no names. On what basis, then, did Arnold decide to have these words spoken by Gudurz?

We must either say that his decision was based on Atkinson's translation or decide with Miss Pound that "the embassy
of Gudarz to Rustum" is an example of Arnold's "fortuitous" "handling."

Going back again to Ferdowsi's story, we see that finally Gudarz's persuasion works, and he succeeds in altering Rostam's firm decision to return to Sēstan. With Rostam and the King in command, the Iranian army arrives one day before the campaign and camps near the White Fortress (See p. 25 above. Arnold substitutes here the march of the Tartar troops). Rostam, who is curious to see Sohrab at close range before the battle, at night and in Turkish attire, approaches the hall where Sohrab and the Turan chieftains have assembled. Among them he sees a young boy whose features do not resemble the Turks, and suddenly he feels a strange attraction to the youth. At this time it happens that Sohrab's uncle who was commissioned by Tahmineh to help her son and, in case of danger, to call for Rostam's aid, sees a shadow, but before he can even raise his voice, is struck dead by one heavy blow from Rostam's fist (Atk. pp. 190-191; 578-579). Thus, the only friendly person who could help Sohrab find his father is killed by Rostam's hand. The next morning, Sohrab, furious because of his uncle's murder and impatient to find his father, questions Hajēr. But Hajēr, who has himself experienced the youth's strength in single combat (before the fort surrendered to Sohrab) and fears that if the two met in battle, Sohrab surely would kill Rostam, pretends
that Rostam is not among the Iranian warriors (Atk. pp. 191-193; 585-587). Thus fate, which had once shut the mouth of Sohrab's uncle with Rostam's fist, now shuts Hajer's mouth in fear for Rostam's life. Frustrated in his hope to find his father, Sohrab challenges the Iranian champions by name and finally challenges forth Rostam by name: "The world-conquering Rostam where is he" (Atk. 588, 16)? Upon which, the Iranians who hear Sohrab's challenge hold their breath with fear, and as Atkinson writes:

Káus [who] was appalled by the insulting boldness of the youth . . . called to his friends to inform Rustem of the dilemma into which he was thrown, and the panic of his warriors, who seemed deprived of their senses. But Rustem had resolved not to fight that day . . . Káus then sent Tús to urge him to comply, and the champion being made acquainted with the distress and terror of the king, hurried on his armour, and left his tent. (Atk. p. 194).

When we compare lines 178-280 of Arnold's poem with Ferdowsi's story, we find that Arnold has integrated into these lines three sections of Ferdowsi's poem: He has drawn from one part of Ferdowsi's story the role played by Gēv in Zabol, and from another the role played by Tus on the day of the battle, and has given both roles to Gudarz, who, in addition, plays his own part--the same part, that is, which he plays in Ferdowsi's poem. Thus in Arnold's poem we see Gudarz instead of Gēv as the man commissioned to carry the King's message to Zabol, and
Gudarz instead of Tus as the messenger who comes onto the battle field to summon Rostam's help, and we find in both poems that it is Gudarz who alters Rostam's decision to leave the army and persuades him to participate in the battle with Sohrab.

In Arnold's poem, beginning with line 192 and continuing to line 290 before the campaign between the father and son begins, are other details which indicate Arnold's dependence on Atkinson's translation. First, is the description of Rostam's tent and its trappings. In Ferdowsi's story, in a passage to which I have referred several times, when Sohrab takes Hajer to the top of the fort, he question Hajer to learn which of the tents is Rostam's. Twice, he points to Rostam's green pavilion and asks Hajer to whom it belongs, and twice Hajer pretends ignorance. As Atkinson translates, Sohrab questions Hajer:

"But mark, that green pavilion; girt around
"By Persian nobles, speaks the Chief renowned;
"Fierce on the standard, worked with curious art,
"A hideous dragon writhing seems to start;
"Thronged in his tent the warrior's form is seen,
"Towering above, the assembled host between!
"A generous horse before him snorts and neighs,
"The trembling earth the echoing sound conveys.
"Like him no Champion ever met my eyes,
"No horse like that for majesty and size;
"What Chief illustrious bears a port so high?"
(Atk. pp. 582-583; see also 191-193) (italics mine)

A few passage later when Tus delivers the King's message, Rostam:

In haste he arms, and mounts his bounding steed,
The growing rage demands redoubled speed;
The leopard's skin he o'er his shoulders throws,
The regal girdle round his middle glows.
High wave his glorious banners; broad revealed,
The pictured dragons glare along the field
Born by Zuara.

(Atk. 589, 10-16; see also 193)

Arnold also depicts a similar scene in his lines 192-194:

... Rustum's tents.
Of scarlet cloth they were, and glittering gay,
Just pitched; the high pavilion in the midst
Was Rustum's and his men camped around.

and a few passage later, in lines 270-279, Arnold also has:

So armed, he issued forth; and Ruksh, his horse,
Followed him like a faithful hound at heel--
The horse, whom Rustum on a foray once
Did in Bokhara by the river find
A colt beneath the dam, and drove him home
Dight with a saddle-cloth of broider'd green
Crusted with gold, and on the ground were worked
All beasts of chase, all beasts which hunters know.
So followed, Rustum left his tents, ...    (italics mine)

As we see, Arnold's description bears similarities
to Atkinson's: In Atkinson's translation, Rostam's tent
is "girt around by Persian nobles;" in Arnold's poem, the
tent is "pitched ... in the midst ... and his men lay
camped around." Atkinson depicts Raksh standing by the
tent, and Arnold depicts him in the same place Rostam, in
both poems, arms and leaves his tent. The chief differences
between the details of the two poems at this point are
that whereas Atkinson pictures the armed Rostam "mount[ing]"
his bounding steed, Arnold depicts the horse "follow[ing]"
after his armed master; that Arnold describes Rostam's
tent as "scarlet" while Atkinson calls it "green"; and
that the tent which Atkinson says is worked with "curious art," Arnold describes as "glittering gay." To account for this latter variation, we need only look in Atkinson's *Shah Nameh* on the same page on which Rostam's tent is described. There, under the description of the warriors' tents is a footnote which may account for Arnold's "scarlet" tent. The footnote reads as follows: "The tents and pavilions of Eastern Princes were exceedingly magnificent; they were often made of silks and velvets and ornamented with pearls and gold. The tent of Nadir Shah was made of scarlet and broadcloth, and lined with satin, richly figured over with precious stones (Atk. 582n.) Notice also that on this same page on which Atkinson is describing the Iranian tents, he uses the word "glittering." (A similar description of Nader Shah's tent is given by Burnes in his *Travels* where he describes the tents of an Indian Raja I, 19). There is still another difference between Arnold's and Atkinson's works. In Atkinson's poem, Rostam wears his "leopard skin" "o'er his shoulders," and on his flag which is carried by his brother Zowareh appears the design of a dragon. Atkinson says nothing about Raksh's saddle. In Arnold's poem, instead of a leopard skin Rostam puts on plain arms and a plumed helmet. There is no mention of a flag, but Raksh's "saddle-cloth of broider'd green" is "crusted with gold, and on the ground were work'd/
All beasts of chase, all beasts which hunters know."
Apparently Arnold preferred to dress his Rostam like a Trojan hero (at least the "plume of horsehair" waving from his helmet is certainly reminiscent of Hector's), whereas in Atkinson's translation it was Sohrab whose "brow" was "graced" with a "Grecian helmet" (Atk. p. 554, 37-38). But apparently, too, he couldn't resist using in some way Ferdowsi's (and Atkinson's) description of the tents and the heraldic banners of the Iranian warriors, the tents brocaded with gold or worked with precious jewels and the banners bearing the heads of different wild beasts--the King's "with the figure of elephant, to denote his royal descent," Gudar's, a lion's head, Fareborz's, a boar's and so on (Atk. pp. 582-585).

In the same passage in Arnold's poem, lines 273-275, it is interesting to note that he describes Rostam as finding Raksh "by the river" "in Bokhara," while it was still "a colt beneath its dam." Atkinson on pages 120-121 describes how Rostam chose his horse from among those on his father's ranch when "his eyes fell upon a mare followed by a foal of great promise, beauty and strength."

Another detail which suggests that Arnold had the patience (contrary to what Tinker and Lowry suggest) to go through Atkinson's translation as well as Malcolm's History occurs in lines 197-199 in which Arnold describes Rostam as a big eater (See. Mal's Hist. I, 19 and Atk. pp. 94-95; 178; 543-544). Still another is his reference to Rostam's
"falcon" in line 200. Apparently the critics have been very eager to locate a source for Rostam's "falcon."

Pound, for example, suggests Malcolm's History (II, 397) where there is a passage on hunting "deer" with "hawks"; and R. Brooks refers to a passage in Marco Polo's Travels where Mongou Khan is said to have "falcons" (A New Source for Matthew Arnold's Sohrab and Rustum P.Q. [Jan. 1963] XLII, 129-131), and still others refer to Homer's Iliad. No one, however, seems to have looked into Atkinson's translations to discover that this bird was actually associated with Rostam and that Arnold did not "fortuitous[ly]" put him in. The first place to look for "falcon" is in Siyawush's story from which, as I have indicated, Arnold borrowed Peran-e Vās. There, in a passage in which Atkinson refers to Rostam's responsibility to train Siyawush, who was the crown prince of Iran, he writes: 

"[Siyawush] was accordingly taught horsemanship, . . . how to hunt with falcon and the leopard" (Atk. p. 209). In another passage related to another story about Rostam, Atkinson writes that the King "dreamt the night before that two white falcons from Persia placed a splendid crown upon his head, and this vision was interpreted by Rustem as symbolical of his father and himself" (Atk. p. 125; see also p. 6 and etc.,).
Stage IV. See Arnold's poem, lines 290-870: The combat between Sohrab and Rostam:

In this long passage, the influence of Homer is strongly felt. The passage also has many points in common with Atkinson's translation and with Ferdowsi's story, such points as the clever skippings and jumpings of Sohrab, the use of spears, swords, and clubs, the dust, the cloud, the fury of the warriors, and little touches of color which help the reader to visualize a single combat. One or two points are especially interesting to look at. For example, in Atkinson's translation, "Sohrab stood on the plain, firm as the mountain Alberz" (p. 194); in Arnold's lines 336-337, it is the "giant figure" of Rostam which is "planted on the sand, Sole like some single tower, ... " Again in Atkinson's translation, while the father and the son struggle, they try their shafts and arrows, "And feather'd shafts in rattling showers descend;/ Thick as autumnal leaves they strew the plain" (Atk. p. 591); in Arnold's line 402, Rostam's spear "drops" down like a "plummet," and the top of Rostam's "spear" in 452 "blazed" like an "autumn-star."

Beginning with line 292, Arnold describes Sohrab putting on his arms. At the same point in the story Ferdowsi has Sohrab arm himself. The difference is that where Ferdowsi pictures Human in Sohrab's quarters while Sohrab arms himself on the third morning of the battle, Arnold has Sohrab in Human's tent.
In lines 299-321, Arnold describes how Rostam viewed Sohrab as the latter approached him:

And Rustum came upon the sand, and cast His eyes toward the Tartar tents, and saw Sohrab come forth, and eyed him as he came. . . . So Rustum eyed The unknown adventurous youth, who from afar Came seeking Rustum, and defying forth All the valiant chiefs; long he perused His spirited air, and wondered who he was. For very young he seemed, tenderly reared; like some young cypress, tall, and dark, and straight.

Arnold's source for the above lines may have been the following in Sainte-Beuve's summary: "Roustem est appelé; il arrive, il se trouve seul en présence de son fils, et le duel va s'entamer. La pitié, tout à coup, saisit le vieux chef, en voyant ce jeune guerrier si fier et si beau:" (p. 348). But it is more likely that the following lines from Atkinson served:

. . . When, surprised, he views Sohrab, endued with ample breast and thews, Like Sam Suwar, he beckons him apart; The youth advances with a gallant heart, Willing to prove his adversary's might. (Atk. p. 589, 16-20)

then:

Rustem considerate, view'd him o'er and o'er, So wonderous graceful was the form he bore (Atk. p. 596, 1-3)

Tall, as the graceful cypress he appears; (Atk. p. 579, 31. See also p. 191 for the "cypress tree")

In a note, Atkinson says: "But Sohrab is dark and mysterious, and as Firdausi says in another place, the unconscious promoter of his own destruction" (Atk. p. 585n.).
Looking at the pages containing the above lines, we can see clearly how Arnold has drawn on Atkinson's translation for his description of Sohrab and that contrary to what Pound suggests, the simile of the cypress tree is not simply an example of "fortuitous" "handling."

The only passage which appears to be drawn entirely from Sainte-Beuve's summary is the following which begins in line 332 with

'O thou young man, the air of Heaven is soft,
And warm, and pleasant; but the grave is cold!
Heaven's air is better than the cold dead grave.

Be governed! quit the Tartar host, and come
To Iran, and be as my son to me,
There are no youths in Iran brave as thou."

Although Atkinson's translation expresses the same idea (Atk. p. 590, 2-12), Mohl's literal translation of Ferdowsi's work, which Sainte-Beuve quotes, is much closer to Arnold's content (See p. 348 for Mohl's translation). Another passage in which Arnold imitates exactly a literal translation of Ferdowsi is that contained in lines 722-724 in which he writes: "And swift; for like the lightning to this field/I came, and like the wind I go away--" But these lines might have been taken from either Sainte-Beuve's summary (p. 350) or Atkinson's translation (p. 202).

Beginning with line 345 in Arnold's poem, Rostam "eyed askance the kneeling youth" and then accused him of
playing tricks. Here, it is suggested by some critics that Arnold's lines 345-369 are an expansion of the following passage from Sainte-Beuve:

En entendant ces paroles qui semblent sortir d'une âme amie, le cœur de Sohrab s'élançoit, il a un pressentiment soudain; il demande ingénument au guerrier s'il n'est pas celui qu'il cherche, s'il n'est pas l'illustre Rostem. Mais le vieux chef, qui ne veut pas donner à ce jouvenceau trop d'orgueil, répond avec ruse qu'il n'est pas Rostem, et le cœur de Sohrab se resserre aussitôt; le nuage qui venait de s'entr'ouvrir se referme, et la destinée se poursuit (p. 348).

But whereas Sainte-Beuve speaks of Rostam's "ruse," Arnold, in a much expanded passage in lines 347-369 and 460-469, speaks of Rostam accusing Sohrab of playing tricks:

"Ah me, I muse what this young fox may mean! False, wily, boastful, are these Tartar boys. For if I now confess this thing he asks And hide it not, but say: Rustum is here! He will not yield ... But will find some pretext to fight, And praise my fame, and proffer courteous gifts, And on a feast-tide, in Afrasiyab's hall, he will arise and cry: [We] changed gifts, and went on equal terms away. Then were the chief of Iran shamed through me. Thou art not in Afrasiyab's garden now with Tartar girls, with whom thou art wont to dance; Speak not to me of truce, and pledge, and wine Remember all thy valour; try thy feints And cunning! all the pity I had is gone; Because thou hast shamed me before both the hosts."

Only in the following few lines in Atkinson's translation is the same idea expressed:

Sternly the mighty Champion cried," Away,--"Hence with thy wiles-- now practised to delay;
"The promised struggle, resolute, I claim,  
"Then cease to move me to an act of shame."  
(Atk. p. 595, 29-32)

However, we should note that Arnold, like Atkinson, has  
Rostam accuse Sohrab of being "wily" and refers to Rostam's  
fear of "shame." What appear to be Arnold's own innovations are the description of "Afrasiab's hall," and of  
"Afrasiab's garden," where the "Tartar girls" sing.  
But new as these ideas seem to be, Arnold would not have  
had to go far to find them, for there is a passage in  
Atkinson's translation of Sohrab's story in which he  
describes the feast which Kawus, the King of Iran,  
arranges in honor of Rostam:

The monarch quick commands the feast of joy,  
And social cares his buoyant mind employ,  
Within a bower, beside a crystal spring,  
Where opening flowers, refreshing odours fling,  
Cheerful he sits, and forms the banquet scene,  
And as around he greets his valiant bands,  
Showers golden presents from his bounteous hands;  
Voluptuous damsels trill the sportive lay,  
Whose sparkling glance beam celestial day;  
Fill'd with delight the heroes closer join,  
And quaff till midnight cups of generous wine.  
(Atk. p. 574, 27-30; 575, 1-8)

There is a "feast," there are the singing "girls," and  
there is "wine" mentioned in both. The difference is, of  
course, that Atkinson speaks of Kawus's "bower," while  
Arnold speaks of Afrasiyab's "garden." As for the phrase  
"proffer courteous gifts," there is a footnote in Atkin- 
son's translation in which he says that: "Among the  
nations of the East, nothing can be done without presents
between the parties, whether the negotiation be of a political, commercial or of a domestic nature. Homer speaks of presents, but they are only proferred conditionally, as in the ninth Iliad, where Ulysses and Ajax endeavour to conciliate Achilles ... But in the East, the presents precede the negotiation" (Atk. p. 555n.).

For Arnold's line 387 in which Sohrab declares to Rostam, "But yet success sways with the breath of Heaven," we find at the same point in Atkinson's translation Sohrab's cry: "Then Heaven! look on," which suggests only that Heaven will witness, not determine, the outcome of the combat (Atk. p. 595, 35). It would appear that in composing Sohrab's remark, Arnold preferred another passage in Atkinson, the one in which Rostam, who by the end of the day is fearful of losing the battle, says to Gēv, "who shall be/Victorious, Heaven knows only:--for by Heaven/Victory or death to man is ever given" (Atk. p. 593, 29-30).

Ferdowsi's description of the end of the first day's strife Atkinson translates as:

Thus the skies a deeper gloom displayed
The striplings life was hastening into shade!
(Atk. p. 593,3-4)

Although he has condensed Ferdowsi's two days of battle into one day, Arnold does not neglect to use the "gloom" which marked the closing of Ferdowsi's first day. In
lines 499-502, he describes the ending of the day as follows:

... but then the gloom
Grew blacker, thunder rumbled in the air,

When, a few pages later, Atkinson translates the scene in which Rostam realizes that he has killed his own son, he writes:

The western sun had disappeared in gloom,
And still, the Champion wept his cruel doom;
The wondering legions marked the long delay.
And, seeing Rakush riderless astray,
(Atk. p. 600, 13-16)

At the same time and place in the story, Arnold writes in his lines 522-525:

And then the gloom dispersed, and the wind fell,
And the bright sun broke forth, and melted all
The cloud; and the two armies saw the pair--

Thus, at exactly the point that Ferdowsi draws a parallel between nature and the tragic scene on the battle field, Arnold also draws a parallel, only reversing the movement of the sun to change the mood and to reveal to the opposing armies the scene which Ferdowsi's "gloom" had obscured. Atkinson's lines also, however, depict a mourning father and a "riderless" horse, neither of which is mentioned by Arnold. But Arnold's work shows that he was indeed a careful reader of Atkinson's translation, for later, in lines 726-732, he writes:

So said [Sohrab], and his voice released the heart
Of Rustum, and his tears broke forth; he cast
His arm round his son's neck, and wept aloud,
And kissed him. And awe fell on both the hosts,
When they saw Rustum's grief; and Ruksh, the horse
With his head bowing to the ground and mane
Sweeping the dust,

From here on Raksh, who is never sharply drawn in Ferdowsi's
Sohrab and Rostam, plays an increasingly important role
in Arnold's poem. As he has made a symbol of the Oxus
River, which was only a geographic boundary in Ferdowsi's
poem, so has Arnold made a symbol of Raksh, and for both
he has created long descriptive passages. One cannot say
that these passages describing the horse and the river are
drawn directly from Ferdowsi. It is interesting, however,
to note that in other episodes of Shahnameh related to
Rostam, Ferdowsi does depict the two quite vividly (For
the Oxus see Atk. pp. 107, 130-131, 207-204 etc.; for
Raksh see Atk. pp. 120-121; 142-151; 532-533, etc.).
Malcolm's History, on the other hand, contains no reference
to Raksh, and Sainte-Beuve's summary, though it does refer
to Rostam's attachment to the horse, does not include a
description of Raksh or his place on the battlefield.

In lines 540-555 of Arnold's poem, the dying Sohrab,
hearing his father's name spoken by the unknown warrior
(Rostam), says to him:

"Unknown thou art; yet thy fierce vaunt is vain.
Thou does not slay me, proud and boastful man!
No! Rustum slays me, and this filial heart.

And now thou boastest, and insult'st my fate.
But hear thou this, fierce man, tremble to hear; The mighty Rostam shall avenge my death!
My father, whom I seek through all the world
He shall avenge my death, and punish thee!
Since there is nothing in Malcolm's *History* or Sainte-Beuve's essay to suggest either as a source for the above passage, we might assume that Arnold wrote it from his own imagination. But the following passage in the same vein does not justify this assumption:

"Vaunt not, in thy pride;
"Upon myself this sorrow have I brought
"Thou but the instrument of fate—which wrought
"My downfall; thou art guiltless—guiltless quite;
"O! had I seen my father in the fight,
"My glorious father!

"But hope not to elude his piercing sight,
"Rustem, with vengeance armed, will reach thee there,
"His soul the prey of anguish and despair."

(Atk. p. 598, 12-16; 599, 1-12)

Little needs to be said about the similarity between the two passages. In both poems Sohrab speaks of the unknown man's "vaunt[less]" "pride," of his own destiny, of his own fault, and of his father's vengeance.

In lines 620-631, Arnold writes that the names the dying Sohrab speaks remind Rostam of his own youth, of Sohrab's mother and her father, and of their hospitality and the pleasant time he had spent in "Ader-baijan." For these lines, the first passage of Sainte-Beuve's summary seems to have been the source, but even though all of the ideas Arnold expresses in his lines are available in the summary, a few small details are not, and they bear close resemblance to details in Atkinson's translation. For instance, in Ferdowsi's story when Rostam in the quest
for his horse Raksh, which had been stolen from him, sees Samangan from afar, Atkinson translates:

O'er vale and wild-wood led, he soon descries, The regal city's shining turrets rise.

(Atk. p. 545, 9-10)

The king of Samangan welcomes him to the city, and his daughter Tahmineh confesses she has always been in love with his great name. With the King's consent, Rostam marries Tahmineh. The next morning he leaves Samangan.

Then, as Atkinson translates:

But when returned to Zabol's friendly shade, None knew what joys the Warrior had delayed; Still, fond remembrance, with endearing thought, Oft to his mind the scene of rapture brought.

(Atk. p. 551, 23-26)

With these lines from Atkinson before us, it is easy to see why in lines 619-631 Arnold, in speaking of Rostam's memories, includes these details:

For he remembered of his own early youth, And all its bounding rapture; as, at dawn, The shepherd from his mountain lodge descries A far, bright city, smitten by the sun, . . . so Rustum saw . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . The castle and the dewy woods, and hunt And hound, and morn on those delightful hills In Ader-baijan.

In both poems Rostam remembers the past with joy, and in both the memory involves a feeling of "rapture." In both, the word "descries" is used, the only difference being that the city Rostam literally "descries" in Atkinson's translation becomes in Arnold's poem a simile for Rostam's youth. Atkinson's "vale" and "wild-wood" become for
Arnold "those delightful hills" and "dewy woods"; his "regal city" whose "shining turrets rise" becomes "A far, bright city, smitten by the sun"; and the "turrets," themselves, Arnold quite logically translates into a "castle."

Although Arnold's simile in lines 633-639, in which he compares Sohrab to:

... some rich hyacinth which by the scythe
Of an unskilful gardener has been cut,

is a commonplace metaphor in Iranian literature, it does not appear in Ferdowsi's description of the dying Sohrab or in Atkinson's translation of the scene. Ferdowsi does, however, employ a simile to describe the untimely death of a youth, and though it is a different one, the idea behind it is not:

All nature fall--the garden's treasures fall
Young bud, and citron ripe--all perish, all.

(Atk. p. 543, 14-15. See Ferdowsi's theme p. 72 below)

For Arnold's lines 768-774, Sainte-Beuve and Malcolm together might have been the source of the poet's inspiration. Though neither contains all of the material Arnold's poem has in common with Atkinson's translation, since they are the acknowledged and accepted sources for the poem, we should examine their possible contribution in comparison with Atkinson's. Following are the pertinent lines from Malcolm's note:

These words were death to the aged hero; when he recovered from a trance, he called in despair for proofs of what Sohrab had said . . . The
sight of his own signet rendered Rostam frantic: he cursed himself, attempted to put an end to his existence, and was only prevented by the efforts of his expiring son (I, 28).

The pertinent passage from Sainte-Beuve's summary is the following in which he has quoted Mohl:

'Pendant bien des jours, je leur ai donné de belles paroles, je leur ai donné l'espoir de tout obtenir; car comment pouvais-je savoir, O héro illustre, que je périsrais de la main de mon père? ... Je voyais les signes que ma mère m'avait indiqués, mais je n'en croyais pas mes yeux. Mon sort était écrit au-dessus de ma tête, et je devais mourir de la main de mon père. Je suis venu comme la foudre, je m'en vais comme le vent; peut-être que je te retrouverai heureux dans le ciel!' (pp. 349-350).

Following is a list of the passages in Atkinson's translation, which, in common with Malcolm and Sainte-Beuve, contain lines parallel to the lines in Arnold's poem, and only a very careful study will reveal the clues in Arnold's work which indicate he has been following Atkinson:


Below, I shall note the similarities between Atkinson's translation for which there are no parallels in Malcolm's note or Sainte-Beuve's summary.

1. In Atkinson's translation, Sohrab, who finds the obstinate old man ignoring his pledge of peace, says:

"Truth has no charms for thee old man, even now," (Atk. p. 597, 21). In Arnold's poem, lines 655-656, when Sohrab finds his stubborn father doubting his words, he
says:

"Man, who art thou who dost deny my words?
Truth sits upon the lips of dying men."

In neither Malcolm nor Sainte-Beuve is "truth" referred to.

2. In Atkinson's translation, when Rostam realizes
that he has killed his own son, he becomes

---Frantic, in the dust his hair
He rends in agony and deep despair;

He beat his burning breast, his hair he tore;
The breathless corpse before his shuddering view,
A shower of ashes o'er his head he threw;

(Atk. pp. 600, 11-12; 603, 20-23)

In lines 700-707 Arnold depicts Rostam in much the same
way:

In both his hands the dust which lay around,
And threw it on his head, and smirched his hair,
His hair, and face, and beard, and glittering arms;

Although Malcolm, too, describes Rostam as "frantic," he
says nothing about "dust"--either on the ground or in the
hair.

3. In Atkinson's translation, the dying Sohrab tries
to comfort Rostam by assuring him that fate decreed his
destiny:

"...disappointment came,
"When thou deniest thy lineage and thy name;
"Oh! still o'er thee my soul impassioned hung,
"Still to my Father found affection clung!
"But fate, remorseless, all my hopes withstood,
"And stained thy reeking hands in kindred blood."

(Atk. p. 601, 15-20)

And in another passage Kawus, the King, while consoling
Rostam says:

"--now Destiny has thrown
"Him on thy sword--he fought and he is gone;
"And should even Heaven against the earth be hurled
That which is past—we never can restore."
(Atk. p. 604, 25-27; 605,1)

In Arnold's poem, lines 708-714, Sohrab says to his father:

"Father, forebear! for I but meet to-day,
The doom which at my birth was written down
In Heaven, and thou art Heaven's unconscious hand.
Surely my heart cried out that it was thou,
When first I saw thee; and they heart spoke too,
I know it, but fate trod those promptings down
Under its iron heel; fate, fate engaged
The strife, and hurled me on my father's spear."

In both poems Sohrab refers to the emotion he felt when he first met his father; in both, it is "fate" (or "Destiny") that has "thrown" ("hurled") him on his father's "sword" ("spear"). In neither Malcolm nor Sainte-Beuve do any of these details appear.

4. In Atkinson's translation, when Rostam attempts to kill himself, Sohrab says: "It has been my destiny thus to perish, it can be of no avail to kill thyself. Let me depart, alone--and thou remain for ever." In Arnold's lines 772-774, Sohrab says:

"Desire not that, my father! thou must live.
For some are born to do great deeds, and live,
And some are born to be obscured and die."

In neither Malcolm nor Sainte-Beuve does Sohrab insist that Rostam live. So many points in Arnold's lines 655-677 appear in Atkinson's translation but not in either Malcolm's History or Sainte-Beuve's summary that we must assume that, whether or not Arnold used Malcolm and/or Sainte-Beuve as sources, he certainly did use Atkinson.
In Anrold's poem beginning with line 778, Sohrab asks his father two favors: First, to allow the Tartar army to cross the Oxus safely, and second, that his body be carried to Sestan,

"And place me on a bed, and mourn for me, Thou, and the snow-haired Zal, and all thy friends. And thou must lay me in that lovely earth, And heap a stately mound above my bones, And plant a far-seen pillar over all. That so the passing horseman on the waste May see my tomb a great way off, and cry; Sohrab, the mighty Rustum's son, lies there, And I be not forgotten in my grave."

The first favor Arnold could have found in any of the three sources. As for the second, Malcolm's note could only suggest the following: "After Sohrab's death, he burnt his tents and all his goods, and carried the corpse to Seistan, where it was interred . . . ." In the above lines, however, Arnold makes other points which are not in Malcolm's note. Apparently these additional points, to which I shall refer below, have been considered to be Arnold's elaboration on Malcolm's passage. The fact is that not only does Atkinson's translation include what Malcolm has about Rostam burning his own tent and goods (See Atk. pp. 204; 604), it also describes Sohrab's obsequies. From the relevant passages I have extracted the following lines for comparison:

And now through Zabul's deep and bowery groves, In mournful pomp the sad procession moves. The mighty Chief on foot precedes the bier His Warrior-friends, in grief assembled near;
The dismal cadence rose upon the gale,
And Zal astonished heard the piercing wail;
He and his kindred joined the solemn train;
Hung round the bier and wondering viewed the slain.

The hoary Sire shrunk backward with surprise,
And tears of blood o'er flowed his aged eyes;
And now the Champion's rural palace gate
Received the funeral group in gloomy state;

With garments rent and loosely flowing hair;
Their shrieks and clamours filled the echoing air;
Frequent they cried; "Thus Sám the Champion slept!
Thus sleeps Sohráb!". Again they groaned, and wept.
Now o'er the corpse a yellow robe is spread,
The aloes bier is closed upon the dead;
And, to preserve the hapless hero's name,
Fragrant and fresh, that his unblemished fame
Might live and bloom through all succeeding days,
A mound sepulchral on the spot they raise,
Formed like a charger's hoof.

(Atk. pp. 605, 27-38; 606, 1-25)

Here, again, Arnold has borrowed from Atkinson a scene
which in Ferdowsi's story is presented as an actual event
and translated it into a thought—in this case, a wish—
expressed by Sohrab. In so doing, he has made few changes
in Atkinson's materials: The burial site beyond the
"bowery groves" and "rural palace" become "that lovely
earth"; the "hoary Sire" becomes the "snow-haired Zal";
"a mound sepulchral" becomes "a stately mound";17 "The
mighty Chief [Rostam], . . . His Warrior-friends . . . /And
Zal" become "Thou [Rostam], and the snow haired Zal, and
all thy friends." The "sleep[ing] Sohrab" in Atkinson's
translation is "place[d] . . . on a bed" (Atkinson's
"bier") in Arnold's poem; the mourners who cry, "Thus
sleeps Sohrab," become "passing horsemen," but they also
"cry"—this time, "Sohrab . . . lies there." And, finally, Atkinson's line, " . . . to preserve the hapless hero's name" becomes, "And I be not forgotten in my grave." It would appear that in adapting the above lines from Atkinson's material, Arnold overlooked little but the "robe" spread over Sohrab's body. However, at the end of the poem, in line 858, we find that after all the "robe" was not spared. There it is: "And the great Rustum drew his horseman's cloak/Down o'er face."

In lines 815-822 Arnold describes Rostam's lament over his dying son:

"So thou mightest live too, my son!
Or rather would that I even I myself,
Might now be lying on his bloody sand,
Near death, and by an ignorant stroke of thine,
Not thou of mine! and I might die, not thou;

And say: O son, I weep thee not too sore,
For willingly, I know, thou met'st thine end!"

Certainly, this passage must be among those Louise Pound refers to when she mentions the "biblical" influences on Arnold. Kenneth Allott, also, in The Poems of Matthew Arnold makes this point by referring to 2 Samuel xviii 33 in his footnote (p. 328n.). Under whatever influence Arnold may have been, the following lines from Atkinson testify that here, as in other cases, Arnold took his material directly from Atkinson's translation:

. . . "By my unnatural hand,
"My son, my son is slain—and from the land
"Uprooted,"

"In my old age," he cried. "what have I done!
"Why have I slain my son, my innocent son!

"Better these hands were from my body wrung;
"And solitude and darkness, deep and drear,
"Fold me from sight than hatred linger here."

(Atk. pp. 600, 9-11; 603, 23-30.
See also the prose pp. 201-202)

And, in another passage in Atkinson, Sohrab speaks to his father of his willingness to die:

"For him I sought, and what an end is mine!
"My only wish on earth, my constant sigh,
"Him to behold, and with that wish I die."

(Atk. p. 599, 3-6)

Here, again, neither Malcolm nor Sainte-Beuve has such details on Rostam's lament.

At the end of his poem in lines 860-861, Arnold compares the giant figure of Rostam "by his son" to "those granite pillars, once high reared/ By Jemshid in Persepolis, . . ." now fallen "on the mountain side."

Here, there is little doubt that Arnold has used a passage in Malcolm's Appendix (where he describes the "pillars" in Persepolis as being made of "black granite") for his simile (Hist. I, 540). The idea for the simile, however, seems to have been borrowed from the following simile of Atkinson's which concludes a long passage on the mortality of man:

"Thus Jemshid fell, and thus must Rustem fall."

(Atk. p. 594, 28)

By associating Jamšhēd with the description of the pillars in Malcolm's note, Arnold creates a new simile, by which he draws a parallel not between the fall of the city of
Jamshēd and the downfall of Rostam but between the down-fall of Rostam and the fall of the pillars once erected by Jamshēd, ruler of a great empire (See Atk. for Takht-e Jamshēd pp. 8-9, 531).

From this comparative study of Arnold's poem and its sources in Ferdowsi, it must be clear both from the plot and from the details that Arnold used Atkinson's *Shah Nameh* as his major source, and that if he drew from other sources, his borrowings from such sources were insignificant in comparison, except those from Homer. A more detailed study would no doubt reveal much more evidence of Arnold's indebtedness to Atkinson. One must read Atkinson's translation over and over again to see how his words and phrases have been integrated into Arnold's poem. Not only words and phrases from Sohrab's story but from other stories of Atkinson's *Shah Nameh* as well. Given the way Arnold selected his materials and then modified, integrated, distributed, combined, altered, and developed them in his poem, it is not always easy to expose his borrowings by juxtaposing a particular passage against another. Arnold has been most ingenious in the way he has accumulated his materials for his *Sohrab* and *Rustum* and in the way he has put them into a new frame. Had he acknowledged all his sources from the beginning, he could have claimed to have written a good poem if not an original one, but still original in the
way he handled Ferdowsi's subjects and Ferdowsi's thoughts. By acknowledging his sources, he would have lost nothing, on the contrary he helped his readers to assess the real merits of his art. The following chapter shows what credit Arnold could have claimed if he had acknowledged Atkinson from the beginning.
CHAPTER IV

SOHRAB AND ROSTAM, THE ORIGINAL
AND MATTHEW ARNOLD'S INNOVATIONS

Matthew Arnold borrowed the story of Sohrab and Rostam from Atkinson's translation of Ferdowsi's epic poem Shahnameh. To it, he added borrowing from Homer's Iliad, Sir Alexander Burnes' Travels into Bokhara, Sir John Malcolm's History of Persia, and Sainte-Beuve's review in Causeries du Lundi (1850) of Jules Mohl's French translation of Ferdowsi. From these sources and his own imagination, he developed a new poem, one quite unlike Ferdowsi's in construction and texture and one which from the Western point of view, at least, is more agreeable to read than Shahnameh, particularly if Shahnameh is read in a poor translation rather than in the original and by a reader who is unfamiliar with the culture, traditions, and aesthetic values of the Iranian nation.

If we look into Arnold's "Preface to Poems" (1853), which contains his theory of poetry, we find him indirectly explaining his reasons for writing Sohrab and
Rustum. He says:

The confusion of the present times is great, the multitude of voices counselling different things bewildering, the number of existing works capable of attracting a young writer's attention and of becoming his models, immense. What he wants is a hand to guide him through the confusion, a voice to prescribe to him the aim which he should keep in view, and explain to him that the value of the literary works which offer themselves to his attention is relative to their power of helping him forward on his road toward this aim. Such a guide the English writer at the present day will nowhere find. Failing this, all that can be looked for, all indeed that can be desired, is that his attention should be fixed on excellent models; that he may reproduce, at any rate, something of their excellence, by penetrating himself with their works and catching their spirits, if he cannot be taught to produce what is excellent independently.

Thus, he establishes the desirability of having models other than contemporary ones. Throughout the "Preface" he praises especially the ancient Greeks from whom, he says, the writer may learn:

three things which it is vitally important for him to know: the all-importance of a subject; the necessity of accurate construction; and the subordinate character of expression . . . He will learn from them how unspeakably superior is the effect of the one moral impression left by a great action treated as a whole, to the effect produced by the most striking thought or by the happiest image. As he penetrates into the spirit of the great classical works, as he becomes gradually aware of their intense significance, their noble simplicity and their calm pathos, he will be convinced that it is this effect, unity and profoundness of moral impression, at which the ancient poets aimed; that it is this which constitutes the grandeur of their works, and which makes them immortal. He will desire to direct his own efforts towards producing the same effect.
Obviously, Arnold's intention was to model his poetry after that of the Greeks. Apparently, however, *Sohrab and Rustum* was the only poem in the edition of 1853 *Poems* which was capable of supporting the theories he had deduced from his models.

In composing *Sohrab and Rustum* he was first of all bound by his Greek models to select an "excellent subject," one which contained a "great human action," preferably an action which belonged to a period "a thousand years ago." Apparently, he found in Ferdowsi such a subject.

The second element which Arnold deemed essential for great poetry was "accurate construction." He explains in the "Preface" that the Greeks "regarded the whole" rather than the parts, and that in their works "not a word was wasted, not a sentiment capriciously thrown in:"

... until at last they produced "a model of immortal beauty."

Although Arnold must have found Ferdowsi's subject full of "great human action," Ferdowsi's construction could not have appealed to him, for the myriad details and sub-plots in Ferdowsi's story do not contribute to the quality of wholeness which characterizes Greek drama. Ferdowsi, of course, was not trying to write Greek drama. For one thing, as Iranian critics have pointed out, his poem in part follows his sources closely. His sources were written to serve as historical records, and history is not noted for the orderliness of its construction--
but is noted for "sentiment capriciously thrown in." Moreover, the art of drama was almost unknown in Iran. What heritage there had been from the Greeks was almost totally lost after the coming of Islam with its strictures against music, sculpture, and drama. All that developed after Islam (not as early as Ferdowsi's time), was a kind of religious drama (See Matthew Arnold's "A Persian Passion Play") which Iranians did not consider a form of art. There was pageantry and dialogue in these plays, but no attempt was made to formulate rules for creating dramatic effects.

If Arnold was to weave Ferdowsi's complex story into the framework of Greek tragedy, he was bound to condense and simplify the material. This he did and did well. Arnold's Sohrab and Rustum also contains the three unities of time, place, and action which Aristotle insisted upon. In Shahnameh, from which Arnold drew his material, the episode of Sohrab and Rostam takes place over a long period of time—a period that extends from Rostam's first meeting with Sohrab's mother through the time that Tahmineh learns about her son's death, and finally ends with Tahmineh's own death. In Arnold's poem, on the other hand, the action covers only one day. It begins at dawn and ends at sunset. The problem of time is solved by having the protagonists recall past incidents. Even when Arnold describes the main plot, or the main action, which
is the battle between the great father and his unknown son, he compresses the three days of the battle into one day. Thus, the action of Ferdowsi's second day, the day the campaign begins and Sohrab prepares himself for the battle, takes place in Arnold's poem on a foggy morning (such a morning as never appears in Ferdowsi's story where all mornings begin with a glorious sunrise); the action of Ferdowsi's first day, in which the armies prepare for battle, takes place in Arnold's poem on the same foggy day but after the fog has lifted. Where Ferdowsi marks the beginning of a new piece of action, again with the rising of the sun, Arnold marks it with the lifting of the fog. The action of Ferdowsi's third day, which begins with Sohrab again arming himself, is also integrated into the one day described in Arnold's poem. In the latter, as in Ferdowsi's poem, this part of the action begins with Sohrab arming himself for the battle.

In _Shahnameh_, the action takes place in eight different places in a cyclic procession. The story begins in Samangan, Tahmineh's home town, and ends in the same place. In between, Ferdowsi takes his readers to Turan and Afrasiyab's headquarters; from there, to the frontier where the battle takes place; then he stops Sohrab there and moves to Kawus's court where the King receives the news of Sohrab's invasion; then to Rostam's residence in Sestan; then back again to Kawus's court, and to the
frontier where the main action takes place. From here, Ferdowsi moves to Zabol, and finally back once again to Samangan. Arnold, on the other hand, begins and ends his story at the frontier region beside the Oxus. In Ferdowsi's poem, even though the central theme and action of the drama is the combat between the father and his unknown son, the poet places as much emphasis on the sub plots of the story as he does on the main plot. In Arnold's poem, the action is centered on only the combat between father and son.

Some incidents of the original story are skillfully included in Arnold's poem. For example, the picture of Rostam remembering his happy days takes care of the first part of Ferdowsi's story, and Sohrab's worry over his mother and his request to be taken to Sestan take care of the last part. Some incidents of Ferdowsi's poem—such as the three separate missions of Gēv, Tus, and Gudarz—in Arnold's poem are condensed into one mission. Other incidents are totally excluded, among them being Afrasiyab's plot with his chieftains against Rostam and his son, the combat at the White Fortress, first with Hajēr and then with his sister, the lovely Gordafred who fought incognito in men's arms and surprised Sohrab with her skill in fighting and for whom Sohrab felt an ardent love; and finally, Rostam's spying which ended with the murder of Sohrab's uncle.
It is only by comparing Arnold's poem with the original that we can see how Arnold has changed and adapted the story to fit the specifications of Greek drama. The weaving of all the essential materials from Ferdowsi's subject into a tightly-knit Greek drama is the great distinction of Arnold's poem. This compactness makes the reading of Sohrab and Rostum outside the context of Shahnameh more pleasant for those who are not familiar with Eastern literature. Arnold, like Homer, has plunged into the heart of the matter and then has woven everything tightly around his main plot. Even though, due to a lack of creativity, part of his poem is repetitious, in reading it one does not feel time dragging as one does in reading Ferdowsi's poem. Ferdowsi, for instance, keeps the invading Sohrab static at the border until the Iranian army arrives after much delay. He does not explain why, if Sohrab's intention was to conquer Iran, he did not move any farther. In order to manipulate his poem, Ferdowsi violates the laws of time, and even though he puts great emphasis on the importance of Sohrab's threat, he moves very slowly to bring the Iranian army to the front (This of course is true of all the ancient epics). In the meantime, he fills with great detail every incident between the time Kawus receives the news of Sohrab's attack and the arrival of the Iranian army at the front. The same slowness of pace is to be
found in the long combat scenes between the father and son. From the Greek point of view, such looseness of structure is not acceptable. But for Iranians who know every character of *Shahnameh* and who have different values in art this deficiency is not felt. They derive as much pleasure from the parts as they derive from the whole. Arnold, however, was concerned with the reaction of a Western audience, and he could be certain it would make no difference to them, as long as he could incorporate the spirit of Ferdowsi's poem into his poem, whether for instance, three different characters summoned Rostam to participate in the battle or one character did.

In speaking in his "Preface" of the "all-importance of the choice of subject; the necessity of accurate construction; and the subordinate character of expression," Arnold insists that the spirit of the "whole" is more important than the expression of the parts, and he urges writers to "penetrate into the spirit of the great classical works" to find the "profoundness of moral impression" in them. That he, himself, succeeded in penetrating into the spirit of Ferdowsi's work is clear in *Sohrab* and *Rustum*. Indeed, he has not only captured Ferdowsi's spirit, he has also created a similar moral effect. And where this differs from the particular "moral impression" Ferdowsi's poem gives, it is because Arnold had a different moral principle of his own to reveal.
The moral problem with which Ferdowsi is concerned in Sohrab and Rostam is man's destiny. In this respect Arnold owed very little to Ferdowsi (Perhaps this is one reason why, in his note of 1854, Arnold did not quote Mohl's translation of Ferdowsi's moral), for other works by Arnold reveal the fact that Arnold was equally concerned with man's destiny, even though his attitude and approach toward the subject were different from Ferdowsi's. A rapid glance at the opening passage of Sohrab's story (Atk. p. 543. See p. 72 below) and one passage close to the end of the first day of the battle (Atk. p. 594. See p. 71 below) show not only the concern of both Ferdowsi and Arnold with man's destiny but also the difference in their attitudes.

Where Arnold in most of his poems is in doubt and is constantly questioning, Ferdowsi is calm and resigned. For Arnold, the mystery of life seems too great to ignore, and at the same time, too terrible to accept. For Ferdowsi, life is a reality of birth and death, and therefore, a total submission to the will of God—which is the doctrine of the Islamic religion. Arnold's question about man's destiny at times reflects a Spinozian attitude. He wants to know which "Force . . . sweeps earth, and heaven, and men and gods along," and whether those "powers we serve" are not "themselves . . . slaves of a tyrannous necessity" (Mycerinus). He is sometimes in doubt whether "Our life
is' not "one long funeral" (Fausta). He wants to inquire

Into the mystery of this heart which beats
So wild, so deep in us--to know
When our lives come and where they go.
(The Buried Life)

But then, in another poem, he answers himself:

But what was before us we know not
And we know not what shall succeed.
(Future)

Ferdowsi, on the contrary, does not doubt or question, and yet he is not disappointed. In the whole of Shahnameh, though fatalism plays a great role in showing man's destiny, the mood is heroic and challenging rather than melancholy as in Arnold's poems. In Sohrab and Rostam Ferdowsi's question is not how man ends because for him there is only one answer: man is doomed to mortality:

"... the will of righteous Heaven decreed,
"That thus in arms her mighty son should bleed.

"Were life prolonged a thousand lingering years,
"Death comes at last and ends our mortal fears;

"This fleeting world, were not endued with power,
"To stay the march of fate one single hour;
"The world for them possessed no fixed abode,
"The path to death's cold regions must be trod;
"Then, why lament the doom ordained for all?"
(Atk. p. 594, 15-27) (italics mine)

His question is that if men know they are doomed to perish, why cannot they be at peace with each other and why must they constantly "provoke each other's fate" (Atk. p. 543, 10. See p. 72 below).
In *Sohrab* and *Rustum* Arnold's usual doubts and questions are reflected in the following lines:

For we are all, like swimmers in the sea,
Poised on the top of a huge wave of fate,
Which hangs uncertain to which side to fall.
And whether it will heave us out to sea,
Back out to sea, to the deep waves of death,
We know not, and no search will make us know;
Only, event will teach us in its hour.

Later, however, to catch Ferdowsi's spirit and to reflect the "moral impression" Ferdowsi gives, he becomes reconciled with Ferdowsi, and a few passages later, in terms of Ferdowsi's philosophy, writes:

"Father, forbear! for I but meet to-day
The doom which at my birth was written down
In Heaven, . . . "

And in another passage:

"O son, I weep thee not too sore,
For willingly, I know, thou met'st thine end!"

The submission he shows in these lines is not usual for the inquisitive and doubting Arnold. This spirit of total submission is definitely Ferdowsi's. Many of the parallels that Arnold draws between man and nature are reminiscent of Ferdowsi's. In the Atkinson translation of the introduction to Sohrab's story, we find:

"O Ye, who dwell in Youth's inviting bowers,
Waste not, in useless joy, your fleeting hours,
But rather let the tears of sorrow roll
And sad reflexion fill the conscious soul.
For many a jocund spring has passed away.
And many a flower has blossomed, to decay;
And human life, still hastening to a close,
Finds in the worthless dust its last repose.
Still the vain world abounds in strife and hate,
And son and sire provoke each other's fate;
And kindred blood by kindred hands is shed,
And vengeance sleeps not—dies not, with the dead.
All nature fades—the garden's treasures fall,

Young bud, and citron ripe—all perish, all.

And now a tale of sorrow must be told,
A tale of tears, derived from Mubid old,
And thus remembered.--

(Atk. p. 543) (italics mine)

Ferdowsi's metaphor of the "garden flowers" and the un-
timely death of a citron bud is well reflected in Arnold's
lines 633-639 in which he draws a parallel between the
"rich hyacinth which by the scythe/of an unskilful gardener
has been cut," and Sohrab's body on the sand. From the
first three italicized lines, Arnold has obviously developed
his metaphor of the Oxus River, that metaphor which dominates
his poem and makes it so different from Ferdowsi's. Even
though the spirit of the above lines controls Ferdowsi's
poem, when he begins to tell his story he does not weave
his parallel by words into his work. It is assumed by
him that his readers will read the whole story of Sohrab
and Rustam with those leading lines of the introduction
in mind, and in reading will see for themselves the
similarities between nature and the course of man's life
and the final "repose" he finds in death. With Arnold,
the metaphor of the Oxus dominates his whole poem.

Here we are not concerned to know whether Arnold's
preoccupation with nature and his parallel between man's
life and the course of a river is the result of his
being under the influence of Senancour, who in turn was
influenced by the Hindu philosophy of the cyclic process of life, whether Arnold was directly under the influence of Hinduism (see Sells, pp. 39-79), or whether his parallels of the river and the sea are not directly borrowed from Wordsworth, who reflects the same philosophy in his The Excursion (iii, 254-262, 984-991; v, 919-921, 1001-07). All that matters for our purpose is that Arnold draws an analogy between the course of the Oxus river and man's life and draws it very strongly and effectively: "As the Oxus whose source is in the" high Pamere (14-15) follows a tumultuous course, then finally calms down and "merges and shines upon the Aral Sea" (880-892), so does man's life begin from the fountain of life and at last rejoin its origin in peace. But while man must die, nature has permanence; and in this permanence she is indifferent to the destiny of man:

So, on the bloody sand, Sohrab lay dead;
And the great Rustum drew his horseman's cloak
Down o'er his face, and sate by his dead son.
As those black granite pillars, once high-reared
By Jemshid in Persepolis,
... . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .
Rustum and his son were left alone,
But the majestic river floated on.

Where Arnold draws a parallel between the course of the Oxus and the course of man's life, and at the same time draws a contrast between nature's permanence and man's mortality and ties nature and man's destiny together as a combination of similarity and contrast, Ferdowsi sees
only a parallel between man's and nature's mortality: Nature, like man, "perishes." And in Ferdowsi's poem the river Jāhun does not demonstrate the parallel to be seen in Arnold's poem. It is merely a borderline between Iran and Turan.20

In drawing the climactic scene of his drama, Arnold seemingly departs from Ferdowsi and presents a different "moral impression" though eventually he manages to produce the "same effect." In Ferdowsi's poem, when Rostam finds himself unable to compete against his strong opponent,

He sought the coolness of the murmuring flood; There quenched his thirst; and bathed his limbs, and prayed, Beseeching Heaven to yield its strengthening aid. His pious prayer indulgent Heaven approved, And growing strength through all his sinews moved; Such as erewhile his towering structure knew, When his bold arm unconquered demons slew. (Atk. p. 597, 3-10)

The fact that God gives him the power he asks for is an irony which Ferdowsi excels in depicting. In Arnold's poem the irony lies in the fact that it is filial devotion that brings about Sohrab's destruction at his father's hand. So amazed and bewildered is he when he hears his beloved father's name cried out by the unknown man, that he drops his shield and lays himself open to the thrust of Rostam's spear:

Then Rustum raised his head; his dreadful eyes Glared, and he shook on high his menacing spear, And shouted: Rustum!--Sohrab heard that shout,
And shrank amazed; back he recoiled one step,
And scanned with blinking eyes the advancing form;
And then he stood bewildred; and he dropped
His covering shield, and spear pierced his side.

Where Arnold departs completely from Atkinson is
in his attempt to create the kind of exotic Eastern aura
which his Victorian readers would expect in an "oriental" poem (See Arnold's letter to Blackett dated Nov. 26, 1853 for his effort to orientalize his poem, in Letters). If he had strictly followed Atkinson's translation, Arnold would not have produced an "orientalized" work at all but one very similar to the European Romance stories, for in Ferdowsi's Shahnameh there is all the heraldry one normally associates with medieval chivalry but nothing with a peculiarly Eastern flavor except the turns of speech and idiomatic expressions Ferdowsi uses, and these are, of course, lost in Atkinson's translation. Arnold, being a translator himself and probably aware of this deficiency in Atkinson, imported into his poem the Turkaman tribes with their ethnical characteristics as described in Burnes Travels, Malcolm's Sketches of Persia, or similar sources. In so doing, he may have helped to give his poem "that naïveté, that flavour of reality and truth which is the very life of poetry," which he mentions in his note of acknowledgement when he claims that he could certainly have made use of a prose translations of Ferdowsi's poem if he could have
met with one. He may have hoped, too, that the additions, which are so foreign to the original poem, would, along with the small and unimportant changes he made in the names of characters, help to disguise his sources. In any case, such a distortion as the painting of the legendary history of Iran with the colors of Central Asian tribes and the Turkaman tribes of the nineteenth century, though it may have satisfied his Western audience and served to disguise his sources, lost for his poem that "supreme character of truth and seriousness, in the matter and substance of the best poetry," which he so highly valued ("The Study of Poetry").
CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

After a long and tedious comparative study of Matthew Arnold's Sohrab and Rustum with its source in Shahnameh, there is little need to say the obvious: that Arnold used a translation of Shahnameh and, to be precise, Atkinson's translation. Why he used a translation is not the question. He, himself acknowledges that: "When any man endeavours to 'remanier et réinventer a sa manière' a great story, which, as M. Sainte-Beuve says of that of Sohrab and Rustum, has 'cours le monde', it may be quite certain that he has not drawn all the details of his work out of his own head" (A.'s note, edition 1854 Poems). The question is why from the beginning he did not acknowledge his sources except indirectly in the "Preface" (1853) where he admits that he had looked among the works of the ancients for a subject that had the "adaptability . . . to the kind of poetry selected." For persons of one culture to borrow from another without acknowledgement was common before Arnold's day. By his time, however, this was no longer the practice.

It is my opinion that Arnold was reluctant to acknowledge any of his sources because he had taken so
much from Atkinson and, to a lesser degree, from Malcolm and Sainte-Beuve, that he preferred to keep quiet lest his public accuse him of lacking originality. Moreover, after laboriously compiling his materials from here and there (from Atkinson, Homer, Malcolm, Sainte-Beuve, Burnes, Wordsworth, and others), after synthesizing, compressing, condensing, and changing the borrowed materials in working toward a "careful construction: of the poem; after attempting to catch Ferdowsi's "spirit" by "penetrat[ing]" into his work, and after striving to express it in terms of his own philosophy and ideas, when the poem was finished at last, he probably felt more claim to it than as a mere borrower. In any case, he was reasonably safe since Atkinson, who could have questioned him on his details of the story, had died a year before the publication of the poem, and to Malcolm and Sainte-Beuve, he felt not much obligation. Furthermore, Arnold was undoubtedly certain that not many of his English readers would have the time or the patience to trace his borrowings, and if they did, he could be certain they would fail. When the censure of his clever friends forced him to speak, he did acknowledge Sainte-Beuve and Malcolm probably because, even with the combination of the two, he still could claim some originality. His letter to Sainte-Beuve (Bonnerot, p. 518; see pp. 5-6 above), regretting that he had not had Sainte-Beuve's article in time to discover
the "necessary details," supports the fact that under the guise of pretending to defend his departures from the original story, he is really claiming credit for his own innovations. It is unfortunate that Arnold failed to recognize the merits of his own work, for there is little doubt that his poem, with its compactness of matter and its tightly-woven framework, is a more pleasant poem to read for those who have no interest in the details of the Iranian epic. And since Arnold's poem is not a translation, it is capable of giving more pleasure to the reader than Atkinson's translation gives. Had Arnold acknowledged all his sources from the beginning, he still could have claimed credit for a pleasant piece of writing and a new tragedy built on Greek principles of drama with an Iranian subject. But he did not acknowledge his sources. What he did, which is even less acceptable, is to distort the Iranian epic. Such changes of names and colors are acceptable only if a poet takes a general subject. In playing with the traditions of a nation, Arnold sacrifices the effect of "truth" which is the essence of good poetry.
NOTES

Ferdowsi's Shahnameh, the longest of the Iranian epics, contains 60,000 lines of rhyming couplets. It took the poet thirty-five years to finish his great work which embraces not only a great part of the legendary history of Iran, but also a part of the recorded history of the pre-Islamic days—a total period of four millennia from the Creation to the fall of the Sasanian dynasty. Shahnameh is a cultural phenomenon of the Iranian Renaissance and represents a declaration of independence after the Islamic invasion. The first Shahnameh, called Khodie Nameh (Annals of the Lords), or as it is best known, Bastan Nameh (Annals of the Ancients), was compiled by the order of Yazdegerd III, the last of the Sasanian dynasty in A.D. 640. In A.D. 957, by the order of Mansuri, the governor of the Iranian province of Korassan, Bastan Nameh, which had been lost, was once more compiled and transliterated from Pahlavi (Middle Iranian) to Farsé (Farsè, or Modern Iranian). Ferdowsi himself makes this point in the introduction of his work, a few lines of which I will quote here from Warner's translation:

All have gone sweeping in the garth of lore
And what I tell hath all been told before,
But though upon a fruit-tree I obtain
No place, and purpose not to climb, still he
That sheltereth beneath a lofty tree
Will from its shadow some protection gain;
A footing on the boughs too I may find
Of yonder shady cypress after all
For having left this history behind
Of famous kings as my memorial.
Deem not these legends lying fantasy,
As if the world were always in one stay,
For most accord with sense, or any way
Contain a moral.

(tr. Warner I, pp. 108-109)

But, eventually, it was through the efforts of Ferdowsi, through the reflection of his elevated and sublime thought, and the flow of his simple but glorious language that Shahnameh became a living work.

81
Rostam: the legendary hero of Shahnameh is still the ideal of heroism and patriotism for Iranians. The cycle of Rostam's stories is one of the best known in the folklore of Iran. Among this cycle are: the story of Rostam's father who was born with white hair, therefore, his parents named him "Zal" meaning old. To keep the ill omen away, as was the custom, Zal's father abandoned the baby in the mountains at the mercy of wild birds and beasts. Later, Zal was found by a wise bird called Semorq (the same griffin, which Arnold chooses as the sign of Sohrab's identity in his lines 679-683), and was nurtured and reared to young manhood by the bird. Zal's amour with Rostam's mother is one of the most romantic dramas of Shahnameh, very like a happy version of Romeo and Juliet. Rostam's birth, owing to his large size, was a threat to his mother's life. If it had not been for the wisdom of Sēmorq, who instructed that an incision be made in the side of the mother, both mother and child would have lost their lives. Rostam's horse, his huge club, his leopard skin and its magic power all are unusual and all are quite well known in Iranian folklore. Rostam's seven labors (as opposed to Hercules' twelve) and his battles with the demons and the enemies of Iran are among the most entertaining stories of Shahnameh.

Arnold's letter to his sister dated Wednesday, May, 1848, which shows that he was certain that the Englishmen of his time were not interested in comparative studies:

How plain it is now, though an attention to the comparative literature for the last fifty years might have instructed any one of it, that England is in a certain sense far behind the Continent. In conversation, in the newspapers, one is so struck with the fact of the utter insensibility, one may say, of people to the number of ideas and schemes now ventilated on the Continent—-not because they have judged them or seen beyond them but from the sheer habitual want of wide reading and thinking: ... (Letters, I).

On the similarity of Arnold's work with Homer's, Mr. K. Allott notes: "Homeric imitation was inevitable in an 'episode' from an epic, but note that Sainte-Beuve refers to Firdausi as 'Homère de son pays'. The Iliad was on all A.'s monthly reading lists from December 1852 until June 1853" (The Poems of M.A., p. 303). I should like to suggest that the reader take a look at Atkinson's Shah Nameh at the pages in which he draws parallels between Ferdowsi and Homer: "Preface," v-ix and pp. 533, 536, 537, 546, 555, 557, 560, 561, 570, 573, 576, 580, 581, 582, 583, 588, 589, 593, etc.
5Samangan, as Ferdowsi locates it, must have been between Iran and Turan—somewhere in the north-eastern part of the present Iran (Safa, Literary History of Iran, I. 304). Atkinson explains: "In Rennell's map, there is a place written Sumenjan, about sixty miles to the south-east of Balkh, in Great Bucharia. Ebn Haukal, the Arabian traveller, comprehends Samengân in the province of Balkh, but says nothing of its relative situation: (Atk. p. 545n.). In changing Samangan to "Ader-baijan (Azarbaijan), Arnold has chosen a north-western province of Iran.

6In his note of acknowledgement in the 1854 edition Poems, Arnold was implicitly referring to the following translations of Sohrab which were available in his time:


7The unfamiliarity of Western critics with the East has sometimes led them to erroneous judgements. For instance, N.R. Goodrich in his Ancient Myths (1963) comments: "Early Western geographers and Mathew Arnold supposed Turan to have been east of the Caspian Sea, and have talked about battles along the Oxus (Amu Darya) River. Since Firdausi did not commit himself, more recent scholars believe that his Turan referred to highly contested areas in the Caucasus, West of the Caspian sea" (p. 107). Or Herbert W. Paul in Matthew Arnold (1902), in his criticism of Arnold's "Sohrab and Rustum" is confused about the difference between Central Asia and Asia Minor. He also calls Rostam a "barbarian," though not an "undignified" one (for the term "barbaric" see also S. Sherman's Matthew Arnold. 1932, p. 109).

One wonders on what basis Mr. Goodrich states that "Ferdousi did not commit himself" to a geographical location for Turan when Ferdowsi states explicitly that Jâhun (the Oxus River) formed the boundary between Iran and Turan. Since nowhere in the whole 1500 mile course of the Oxus (which now marks 680 miles of the Russian-Afghan border), does it flow west of the Caspian Sea, it is obvious that "early Western geographers and Matthew Arnold" were right when they "supposed" that Ferdowsi's Turan was east of the Caspian. It is true that Ferdowsi does not generally commit himself to time and place, but it appears that the "more recent scholars" Goodrich refers to have not read
Ferdowsi carefully, or if they have they have not looked at an Atlas. Such must be the case of Mr. Paul who suggests that Asia Minor and Central Asia are the same.

It is curious, too, that Western critics should apply the term "barbaric" to people whose civilization was much in advance of Western civilization at the time. It is especially curious that Rostam who, in Ferdowsi's poem, is seen receiving and reading letters should be described as a "barbarian." It is not often--at least it was not often before the rise of Hitler and the Third Reich in Germany--that one finds literate barbarians.

Another example of the Western critics unfamiliarity with Iranian myth is the story of Sohrab's identification sign (See note No. 11).

Arnold incorporated parts of other episodes of Shahnameh into his Sohrab and Rostam: e.g. A.'s ll. 38-39 and 65-72 are borrowed from the "Story of Siyawush," Atk. pp. 225-226; A.'s ll. 679-684 on Sohrab's identification sign are borrowed from the story of "Zal" either from Mal.'s Hist. I, 18 or Atk. pp. 71-75; A.'s ll. 827-834 on the death of "Kai Khosroo" are borrowed also either from Mal.'s Hist. I, 41-42 or Atk. p. 368.

The use of the terms "Tartars" and "Tartary" by Malcolm and Arnold, "Turcs" by Sainte-Beuve, and "Turan" and "Turanian" by Atkinson has been the cause of much confusion. The reason for this discrepancy of terms is based on historical interpretations of names. Ferdowsi, himself, identifies the Turks of his time, living in Central Asia, with the Scythian people called "Turanian" in Avesta. Richard N. Frye in his Heritage of Persia, pp. 38-39, explains the relation of Turks and Turanians as follows:

It is possible that in Islamic times the Turks were really equated with a Tur people of an earlier age, since the designation 'Turk' is probably a plural Turk'k, with the word 'Tur' designating some totem among the Ur-Turks of Central Asia. Hence Turkie Tur-k would equal Iranian Tur-an, also a plural. The history of the word 'Turan,' scanty though it is, however, must be investigated.

The name Tur appears several times in Avesta as Tura, and the earliest mention of the Tura people, never a district. . . . Although the Tura in the Avestan age were most probably Iranian, perhaps the memory of struggles with aborigines played a
part in the development of the epic. Later, of course, the Turks conveniently took the role of the great enemies of Iran.

Sir John Malcolm in his History explains why he has used "Tartar" and "Tartary." He says: "I have in this place and others used the European names Tartary and Tartars. These terms are unknown to the natives of the East. Tartary was formerly called Turan, and is now called Turkistan" (I, 24n). See also Atkinson's note on "Turan" and "Tur" (p. 519).

10 The Jahan, or the Oxus river, has vital importance in the legendary history of Iran. Even though Ferdowsi mentions the river but once in Sohrab's story, for those who know Shahnameh well, it is clear from the beginning that Sohrab's campaign with his father takes place on the border of Iran and Turan. As is noted in Shahnameh, the first King of the Keyanian dynasty called Feradun divided his vast territory between his three sons: Iraj's share was Iran, Tur's share was Turan, and to Salm was assigned the western territory reaching to Rome. Feradun also decreed that the Jahan river be always kept as the borderline between Iran and Turan (Atk. p. 50, 130; Mal. I, 14). After Feradun died, Iranians and Turanians constantly trespassed over each other's borders, and Rostam was repeatedly commissioned to turn back the Turan invaders from the border.

11 Arnold, in lines 667-686, describes Sohrab's sign of identification as the design of a "griffin" tattooed on Sohrab's arm. In Atkinson's translation the sign is an "amulet" and/or "bracelet"; in Sainte-Beuve's summary of Mohl's translation, it is an "onyx"; and in Malcolm, it is a "seal." The idea of a tattoo was apparently original with Arnold; at least, it does not appear in any of the sources I have examined. The idea for the design itself obviously came from either Malcolm or Atkinson and not from Marco Polo's Travels as Roger Brooks suggests in his "A New Source for Matthew Arnold's Sohrab and Rustum," P.Q. (1963) pp. 129-131. The story of Zal and the griffin who reared and nurtured him is part of Rostam's myth which is described in Shahnameh (Atk. pp. 71-75; Mal.'s Hist. I, 18 and p. above). As for the sign itself, both Atkinson and Mohl have correctly translated Ferdowsi's word "mohreh" which literally does mean "onyx" but is also interpreted by Iranians to mean "armband" or "bracelet" since Ferdowsi indicates that Rostam wore it on his arm. On the armband there was a seal which is said to have had magic power (See also Atk.'s reference to Rostam's "seal" on page 534).
12 For Sohrab's sign of identity see No. 11 above.

13 In The Poems of M.A., Mr. Allott notes that Arnold has put the "Ilyats of Khorassan among the Persian forces, but describes them as Tartars" (p. 305n.). Incidentally here Arnold is not misplacing the "Ilyats of Khorassan" by mistake among the Iranian troops, if we forget Shahnameh and think of Iran in the 19th century when Burnes and Malcolm wrote their travel accounts. Because these Ilyats (Ilyat is the plural of the word El or Il meaning tribe) who still constitute part of Iran's present population are of Turkaman decent with Mongolian characteristics and features—slanted eyes and high-cheek bones. They speak a Central Asian Turkish dialect and even at this date have kept their ethnical characteristics.

14 Ferdowsi is often censured by Western scholars for his hyperboles and for employing, as Edward Brown comments, "unnecessary and monotonous" similes. Brown comments that every hero in Shahnameh appears as a "fierce war seeking lion," a "crocodile," a "raging elephant" or moves like the "wind" or the "smoke" (A Literary History of Persia, II, 142). But aside from the fact that hyperbole was customary in most ancient epics, Brown and the like forget the fact that different nations and different eras have different literary styles and literary values.

15 Atkinson and Mohl must have used different manuscripts of Shahnameh for their translation. The one which Mohl has translated is recognized by Iranian authorities as the best manuscript of Ferdowsi's work. In MSS that Mohl has used, Rostam knows that he has a son, only he cannot believe that the boy could be so grown up to have become a warrior. Ferdowsi says here that after Sohrab asked his mother about his father's identity, she showed him a letter which Rostam had sent her when he had learned of his son's birth, along with three pieces of rubies and three bags of gold.

16 Ferdowsi depicts Sohrab in "Roman" helmet and armor. Atkinson translates "Grecian."

17 "mound sepulchral": Most critics think Arnold has taken his "mound and pillar" from Homer. Eventually Atkinson must have taken his "mound sepulchral" also from Homer, because in Ferdowsi's story there is no mention of a mound. Sohrab's body is put into a wooden bier inlaid with wood and then is put into a vault.
18 Miss Pound attributes Arnold's simplicity to the fact that he has followed Malcolm's simple note.

19 Mubid: is a Zoroastrian priest, but in his poem Ferdowsi does not write Mubid; he says the story is told by Dehqan. Dehqans were a class of nobility in ancient Iran who recorded the historical events of the Sasanian period.

20 Arnold's use of the name Oxus has made Pound think that he was following Malcolm because in the three chapters of Malcolm's History she sees that name repeated several times.

21 Arnold in his letter to Blackett dated Nov. 26, 1853, defending his similes speaks of his effort to orientalize his poem: "What you say about the similes looks very just upon paper, I can only say that I took a great deal of trouble to orientalize them (the Bahrein divers was originally an ordinary fisher), because I thought they looked strange, and jarred, if Western." If Arnold had used Malcolm as his source, as he said, he did, then he would have seen that Malcolm records in his History: "The Gulf of Persia has several pearl fisheries, particularly that near the island of Bahrein" (II, 370). This indicates that Bahrein fishers must have been divers and not "ordinary fisher[s]." Even though Bahrein fisheries are exhausted today, still divers fish for pearls.
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