

“In the Irish-Sufic Tradition”: Robert Graves and Idries Shah

Michel Pharand

Idries Shah (1924-1996) was thirty-seven when the sixty-five-year-old Graves met him on 17 January 1961. The Afghan writer was visiting Mallorca and wrote to Graves requesting a meeting, explaining that he was engaged on a study of ecstatic religions and experiments in mushroom-eating. Shah was probably familiar with Graves's *Food for Centaurs* (published the previous year) and two of its essays, “Centaur's Food” and “Maenads, Junkies and Others,” on that topic. Graves's interest in mushroom cults was well-known and had begun in the mid-1950s when he met the American hallucinogenic-mushroom expert Gordon Wasson, with whom he was still in close contact.

“I have learned a great deal from you,” Shah wrote to Graves after their first meeting (R.P. Graves 326), and after they met again on January 22 and 23, he “very rapidly established himself as one of Graves's most trusted and most influential friends” (R.P. Graves 326). There was even an Oxford connection: Shah would soon marry a woman who had coincidentally been brought up in Islip, where Graves had lived in the 1920s (R.P. Graves 333). On 30 May 1962, when Graves wrote to Wasson that Shah had some new information for him about mushroom-eaters, he claimed there existed “a scientifically inexplicable serendipitous nexus of thought between a few people” (O'Prey 213). Like the philosopher Basanta Mallik in the 1920s and Wasson in the 1950s, Shah was one of those people whose passion—in this case, Sufism—had its limited but important influence on Graves. The distinguished author, writes Miranda Seymour, “welcomed a philosophy which fitted in with his own ideas about intuition and the value of talismanic objects, while adding a spiritual dimension” (399). Graves the magpie had found another gem for his eclectic collection of theories and ideas.

What fascinated Graves at the outset was Shah's introduction of the Islamic idea of baraka, variously translated as blessedness, holiness, inspiration, or virtue. This concept coincided in spirit with Graves's mushroom-eating experience only a year before, an event that had a profound effect on him. He found baraka of sufficient interest to give two lectures about it, first to the Oxford University Poetry Society, then to the American Academy and Institute in mid-May. He spoke of baraka as “the sudden divine rapture which overcomes either a prophet or a group of fervent devotees (Dervish dancers, for example,

or the primitive Christians at the Feast of Pentacost) whom it unites in a bond of love" (*On Poetry* 359). More interesting still was that "[a] poem can have baraka, inspired by the Muse; and the Moslem Sufis, surprisingly enough, own to a female Muse" (360). Works of literature, art, architecture, music, relics, amulets, keepsakes, hand-made things, "a pair of blue jeans so often washed that they have faded almost white": all possess baraka (360-361). But Graves also cautioned that the "stored-up baraka inevitably dies" in hand-made objects displayed behind glass in a museum (361), and he was disappointed that The King James Bible, with its archaic diction and speech-rhythms, was being supplanted by The New English Bible, "a translation carefully purged of all baraka" (362). The word was to remain an important touchstone in Graves's vocabulary for many years.

Unfortunately, no amount of baraka could save Graves from the complications that arose with the advent of his new Sufi friend. Despite the powerful affinities he was feeling for Sufic thought, certain misunderstandings came between Graves and Shah—just as they had between Graves and Wasson—that would eventually lead to unresolved ambiguities. The question would be asked: was Idries Shah everything he claimed to be? When Graves met them, Idries and his brother Omar Ali-Shah were reputed authorities on Sufism, a claim that Idries solidified with *The Sufis* (1964), his exposition of Sufic thought for Western readers that Graves encouraged him to write, and for which Graves provided an introduction. Yet if Shah is often referred to as 'King of the Sufis' (O'Prey 15), some of the claims about his origins in Graves's introduction were questionable—and questioned. Graves described him as belonging to "the senior male line of descent from the prophet Mohammed," and as having "inherited the secret mysteries from the Caliphs, his ancestors." According to Graves, Shah was "as conversant with English and the main European languages as with Arabic, Pushtu, Urdu, classical and modern Persian" (*The Sufis* xx, xxi). However, a Reader in Persian at the University of Edinburgh wrote in 1975 that this was merely an attempt to "upgrade" Shah's "undistinguished lineage, . . . a rather unfortunate gaffe, since all three sons of the Prophet died in infancy" (quoted in O'Prey 311-312, n. 57).

In addition to Shah's pedigree, his version of Sufism was considered controversial because it eschewed Islamic religion in favour of a secret lore available only through direct contact with a Sufi master. His short preface to *The Sufis* outlines some basic principles: the "secret tradition" of Sufism can only be transmitted by means of a teacher; Sufic

thought strives after “ultimate knowledge” rather than mere theorizing; it is “occult and mystical” in that the path it follows is not “that which has been represented as the true one by authoritarian and dogmatic organization” (*The Sufis* xxiii-xxv). It may be these esoteric and idiosyncratic aspects that attracted Graves to Sufism in the first place, as well as a universality that he stressed at the outset in his introduction to Shah’s book, a long (about 4500 words) and encyclopedic account of what he called an “ancient spiritual freemasonry” bound by no dogma, place of worship, monastic organization or religious instruments (ix). Although no distillation will do them justice, some of his observations provide insights into why Graves wholly embraced Shah’s ideology.

The Sufic ideal, writes Graves, is “to be ‘in the world, but not of it,’ free from ambition, greed, intellectual pride, blind obedience to custom, or awe of persons higher in rank” (x). A Sufi is “enlightened by actual experience...not by philosophic argument” (x), an enlightenment that “comes with love—love in the poetic sense of perfect devotion to a Muse who, whatever apparent cruelties she may commit or however seemingly irrational her behaviour, knows what she is doing. She seldom rewards her poet with any express sign of her favor, but confirms his devotion by its revivifying effect on him” (x). Graves also found in Sufism a striking parallel to Celtic mythology: “The Irish Muse-goddess Bridget was threefold like the Muse celebrated by Ibn El-Arabi” [the Sufi master poet, 1165-1240] (xiii). Moreover, “poets were the chief disseminators of Sufi thought, earned the same reverence as did the ollamhs, or master poets, of early medieval Ireland, and used a similar secret language of metaphorical reference and verbal cipher” (xi). It all began with the Druids “lopping mistletoe from a sacred oak” and the custom of tying it to the lintel of a door and inviting “sudden and surprising kisses. The symbolism is exact, if we can equate Druidic with Sufic thought, which is not planted like a tree, as religions are planted, but self-grafted on a tree already in existence; ...and the main motive power of its growth is love,...a sudden surprising recognition of love” (xii-xiii). Graves goes on to describe at length literature’s considerable debt to Sufism. Wilhelm Tell, Don Quixote, Roger Bacon, Raymond Lully, Averröes, Chaucer, Sir Richard Burton, even Freemasonry itself: all have Sufic origins.

It also appears that Sufism had for centuries been the presiding spirit of Graves’s adopted Spanish home. The bat, which King James of Aragon chose as his emblem upon capturing Majorca in 1229 and still found on the arms of Palma, had a Sufic meaning that must have

Because the world is in a sick condition and we are all somehow infected, against our will, even if we think we are whole in mind and soul and body" (O'Prey 224). Evidence that Graves was thinking along Sufic lines at this period is found in "Nine Hundred Iron Chariots," a lecture he delivered a few weeks later at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology:

Almost every poet has a personal Muse, a relationship first introduced into Europe from Sufi sources in Persia and Arabia during the early Middle Ages. She embodies for him the concept of primitive magic; ... Once the Muse takes individual form, she remains absolutely free and in control of the situation. The poet-Muse relationship can never be a domestic one, nor need it be sexually consummated, since despite all the symptoms of romantic love, it belongs to another order of experience—which, for want of a better term, we must call 'spiritual' and which is usually characterized by remarkable telescopings of space and time by cosmic coincidences...created by the power of thought. (O'Prey 224-25)

"This was a case," Seymour writes, "of Graves reading into Sufism what he wanted to find" (400). Moreover, such a "spiritual" order of experience was not always stable or predictable, and on 6 May Graves was writing to Shah—"the one person I can commune with"—of his discovery made two days earlier that Margot, for the past month, had been living with a "young, sweet, honest, industrious...rich successful New York Jew in show-business"—Mike Nichols. Her affair left Graves feeling physically ill, and he lamented to Shah that, "despite Margot's taking on the Goddess role and talking with beautiful truth and clarity about it," he was again suffering "that sorrow-pain of the solar-plexus" and had lost twenty-two pounds. He told Shah that he had written to Margot about Shah's warning against "using her infallibility as a Goddess for other ends, and the danger of losing baraka and her whole being" (O'Prey 226).

However, Margot saw Graves off at the airport on 16 May and he returned to Deya. In the aftermath of what he considered Margot's betrayal, Graves composed his Oxford lecture, "Intimations of the Black Goddess," in which he wrote of the Muse's infidelity and of the poet's suffering: "His test will be: which gives the greater pain—belief or disbelief" (quoted in O'Prey 231). Graves was now concerned with a new "black" goddess, an idea derived from the Sufic tradition of

wisdom as blackness. Graves wrote to Shah: "The real point is when and how the White Goddess who walks impartially between good and evil (evil, being as you say, nothing, delay, ambiguity, irrelevance, cleverness, cowardice, insensitivity, a draining of bakara) will become the Black Goddess of Wisdom" (O'Prey 232, undated). This goddess "promises a new pacific bond between men and women," Graves said in his lecture, "corresponding to a final reality of love,...she will lead men back to that sure instinct of love which he long ago forfeited by intellectual pride" (quoted in R.P. Graves 369). Far from being a tormentor, the Black Goddess represented "a miraculous certitude of love," and Graves pointed out that the Provençal and Sicilian Black Virgins were Sufic in origin (quoted in Seymour-Smith 521)

Could Margot become a Black Goddess? Graves tried to get her to join him in Majorca and even wrote her unposted letters—presumably meant to be 'sent' telepathically—telling her that she had to make a new start and dedicate herself wholeheartedly to her most important role (R.P. Graves 371, letter of 4 June). But she was not destined to assume that role—she married Nichols in July—and in any event that summer Graves found a new Muse, Cindy ("Aemile") Laracuen.

* * *

The Sufis was published on 17 January 1964, and the next day Graves wrote to Shah that he was proud to have assisted in its publication. The book "is a reminder of my enormous ignorance about so many essentials that I wonder that you treat what knowledge I have with respect" (O'Prey 235). Graves read the book a number of times, writing to Shah on 4 February that its "deliberate unliterariness" was necessary: "To show that you are not selling anything. At first it disappointed me: professionally—as if I found the village carpenter using an out-of-date and awkward hand adze instead of an electric plane" (O'Prey 235). And although Seymour-Smith dismisses Shah's effect on the poetry—"Idries Shah is not of interest, at least in the context of Graves's poetry" (555)—Graves wrote that lately he was also "thinking of my own poems in terms of the Sufi ones. The spirit is the same, when I am really inspired, but the terms of reference are very different.... But the theme of love is both personal and religious in the Sufic sense, and always (now) more consciously so" (O'Prey 235-236). Shah replied that he was often accused of trying to assert himself, and so when people came to him for help, he would make them believe they had come to their own conclusions without him. Nonetheless, he

wrote several years later that he had still not "escaped charges of being a 'would-be guru'" (O'Prey 236). The same might be said of Graves himself during this period and for some years to come.

In a long letter of 21 May, Graves ascribed the initial poor American sales of *The Sufis* to Shah having been careful "not to make it read like an advertisement for a new World Religion." Graves distinguished the 'art' of writing ("selling shoddy ideas as though they were true") from the 'craft' of writing ("avoiding confusion and boredom and atmospherics and...unparallel similarities, and...mixed metaphors").

"Various facts of immense interest to readers in *The Sufis* are thrown away by deliberate unemphasis," Graves wrote, but nonetheless called it "a marvellous book, and will be recognized as such before long" (O'Prey 240-241).

On 10 February, Graves had written: "I would not dare to claim myself a Sufi: but I believe I can now recognize the essential quality in others" (O'Prey 237). Graves soon came to recognize the Sufic qualities of his new Muse, Cindy Laracuen, to whom he sent a copy of *The Sufis* upon publication. Graves had come to see her "both as 'Cindy' (her 'false' identity as a fun-loving alcoholic junkie) and as 'Emile' (her 'true' identity as an incarnation of the Black Goddess)" (R.P. Graves 381). She had even taken a vow and made a pact with Graves (witnessed by Shah) and had been 'adopted' as Shah's spiritual sister in a solemn ceremony (O'Prey 238). Graves later told Shah about the "strange healing power that seems to affect people when we enter a room together," a result perhaps of "the strength of our personal bond" (O'Prey 239, undated). At last Graves had found his Sufic goddess and "was now ecstatically in love" (R.P. Graves 388).

However, when the temperamental Cindy proved a problematical Black Goddess and Shah began to distance himself from the affair, Graves reproved him for not standing by her "as was your duty as a brother." She had perhaps made an appeal to Shah for help or advice which he had ignored. "To me the most important problem in the world," Graves went on, "is the fateful relation of woman's being to man's doing and I have myself learned more from her on this subject than from anyone else in the world. So could you." But he told Shah he was not "criticizing or reproaching" him, and closed the letter with "Love and Baraka" (O'Prey 242-243, letter of 2 July 1964).

By mid-July, Graves was rereading *The Sufis* as well as his recent poems, "all concerned with the central problem of wisdom through love, and the true relation between the poet and his beloved" (O'Prey 243). And although Cindy's capricious behaviour continued—she had

recently returned to a former lover—Graves remained in sufficiently good spirits to compose his annual village play, this one entitled *To The Lighthouse*, a murder mystery based on the assassination of Ringo Starr. Some lyrics (quoted in R.P. Graves 394) are particularly ironic:

I'm a Sufi, Aren't we all?
 Goofy Sufi on the ball
 In our mystic dreams it seems
 That wisdom comes to call.

Graves was to pay quite a price for whatever wisdom his Black Goddess had endowed him with: in March the next year, he flew to New York, took Cindy to Mexico, and two weeks and £2,000 later returned to Deya alone—on money borrowed from Gordon Wasson—leaving Aemilia (as she had now become) in Puerto Vallarta with her friends. The Sufic goddess eluded Graves—at least for the time being.

According to Seymour-Smith, the concept behind the Black Goddess remained unclear for Graves: "He never formulated it properly, and it came to nothing" (518). The Black Goddess "was never of true importance in his thinking, and no woman succeeded in permanently representing her" (521). Although, as we have seen, the last part of this last statement is partially true, the concept of a Black Goddess was for a time extremely important in Graves's thinking and clearly left a strong imprint on his poetry. The idea of a Sufic Black Goddess thrived in it for over a decade and was to some extent instrumental in the creation of nearly 450 poems published in six volumes (Cf. Quinn 129-141): "Most of the poems are inspired by young women in whom Graves found the spirit of the Goddess incarnated. No longer paying homage to a cruel, distant deity, he celebrates real, sensuous women" (Quinn 129). In the foreword to *Poems 1965-1968* (which contains the final poems to Cindy and the first ones to Juli Simon, his Muse from October 1966), Graves pointed out that his theme was "experiences which, as in Classical Persian poetry, transcend ordinary physical circumstances" (quoted in O'Prey 257-258). Michael Kirkham finds in the poems of this period a "tone of resolute stoicism" (77) reflecting a "faith in a new kind of love" (81), a concern with "the fusion of pain and ecstasy that is the essential characteristic of the Black Goddess experience" (82). The poem entitled "The Black Goddess" appeared in *Man Does, Woman Is* (1964), and although no mention is made in the foreword of the Black Goddess, "in any poetry he [Graves] should

write in the future she would have a major role to play" (83). In fact Kirkham considers "The Black Goddess" a seminal statement of Graves's poetic achievement, a record of "the poet's awed bewilderment, simple relief, and gratitude for this illumination but not the desire for rational explanation. The possession of this reality...has all along been the goal of Graves's poetic efforts" (89). The original 1963 lecture on the Black Goddess was published in *Mammon and the Black Goddess* (1965) and in *On Poetry* (1969).

* * *

Graves was still under the Sufic spell when, in October 1966, while in London recovering from a gall-bladder operation, he began translating into English verse the *Rubaiyyat* of Omar Khayyam, a work whose most popular English version thus far had been the nineteenth-century verse translation of Edward Fitzgerald. It was not Idries this time but his brother, Omar Ali-Shah, who became Graves's guide. He provided Graves with a literal crib of a twelfth-century Persian manuscript—the so-called 'Jan Fishan Khan' manuscript, after Shah's great-great-grandfather—belonging to his family. This text, Omar claimed in his introduction, was "of uncontradictable authority," and "Khayyam's Sufi connections form part of the oral tradition which has been handed down in my family for the last nine centuries" (quoted in Seymour-Smith 557). As he had done earlier for Idries, Graves specified in his own introduction that Omar's family connections could be traced all the way to the Prophet Mohammed.

However, most classical Persian scholars were skeptical: J. C. E. Bowen eventually made the claim (in 1973) that "Omar Ali Shah has no more than a nodding acquaintance with the Persian language, and knows very little about Persian literature," explaining that Omar's crib was based on an English compilation of originals used by Fitzgerald himself (quoted in *Canary* 128). Moreover, in their introductions Graves and Omar attacked Fitzgerald's version as well as his claims that Khayyam was an anti-Sufic hedonist and epicurean. "Khayyam's original poem was written in honor of God's love and spiced with satires against the Moslem puritans of the day," said Graves in his 1969 *Paris Review* interview. They wanted to show that the book was in effect a deeply religious work by a great Sufi teacher and poet: "Fitzgerald got it all wrong: he believed Khayyam really was a drunkard, and an unbeliever, not a man who was satirizing unbelievers. It's amazing how many millions have been fooled by Fitzgerald. Most of

them will hate being undeceived" (Plimpton 60).

Paradoxically, this very aspect—the Rubaiyyat's spiritual quality—did not coincide with Graves's still vigorous amorosness. "But that the divine love he felt for his friend from Shiraz was comrade love," he wrote to Idries from hospital, "without the least hint of bodily love, disappoints me. I had hoped it was love for a woman and would give a precedent for my impossible love for Aemilia and hers for me, which cannot be divorced from bodily love" (O'Prey 254). Nonetheless, Graves was deeply affected by Omar's crib and discovered in it certain affinities to his own poetic pursuits. Writing to Idries on 16 December 1966, he went so far as to claim: "I might have qualified as a disciple of Khan Jan-Fishan Khan himself, had I been humble enough!" He continued: "It is strange that the poetic principle which I have always formulated for my moral path should correspond so closely with Sufism: and it is an Irish tradition to combine poems of love with satire and sudden violent contrasts of attitude. The famous early Irish poem *The Madness of Suibne* ('Sweeny') should be translated into Classical Persian, where it belongs. The Sufi influence is unmistakable" (O'Prey 257). On 6 August he was correcting the proofs as well as Omar's introduction (which he completely rewrote), rereading the poem with palpable enthusiasm, empathizing with Khayyam—"How he must have suffered!"—and praising his eloquence (O'Prey 264).

Much controversy followed the publication of *The Original Rubaiyyat of Omar Khayyam* (1967; 1968 in America). There was even a Columbia University doctoral dissertation (1969) written about the Graves-Shah translation that expressed doubt about the reliability of the Shah manuscript and the identification of Omar as a Sufi (cf. Canary 151, n. 4). Much of it arose because Graves and Omar-Ali had asserted in their introductions that the Chester Beatty (AD 1259) and Cambridge University Library (AD 1207) manuscripts were probably late copies, and that the Shah family manuscript—which Graves had never seen—was authoritative. When he finally did ask to see the manuscript, Idries Shah refused, telling Graves (in a letter of 30 October 1970) that it was not in his possession, that excellent forgeries were produced in Iran, and that in any case radio-carbon dating was useless on such ancient parchments. Moreover, even if he possessed it, "I would have no hesitation at all in refusing to show it to anyone under any circumstances at any time whatever." Even Shah's father, the Sirdar Iqbal Ali Shah, wrote to Graves from Morocco asking that the manuscript be produced. Although Graves sent that letter to Omar, it was never

received, and unfortunately Omar's father died in a car crash in Tangiers a few days later (O'Prey 281).

Clearly, Graves was out of his depths from the beginning of this project, and he had to admit in "Translating the 'Rubaiyat'" (in *Steps*, 1969): "I am...no Persian scholar and therefore followed closely an annotated English text with which Omar Ali-Shah had supplied me" (quoted in Seymour-Smith 556). Nonetheless, Graves's rendition, although labeled "prosy," succeeded in achieving Khayyam's concentration of expression far better than had Fitzgerald: "he sacrificed technical fluency to a sense he was persuaded was sacred," writes Seymour-Smith (556).

The affair came to an ambiguous close when Graves wrote to Idries on 11 November 1970 to complain about newspaper attacks by pupils of Persicologist A.J. Arberry—author of a 1952 translation of the Rubaiyyat based on the Beatty and Cambridge manuscripts—who were trying to prove that the Jan Fishan Khan manuscript was a forgery. He reminded Idries of his promise to produce it from Afghanistan, "where the Guardians of the Tradition would allow you to borrow it for a while, as the senior member of the family to whom the Sultan gave it in 1153." Moreover, the considerable bad press had not only cast doubt on his historical writings, he told Idries, but had also reduced royalties that heretofore had helped support about a dozen relatives (O'Prey 282). But Shah's reply was short and businesslike, and the manuscript never materialized. Even in 1978, when there was enough evidence to suggest that the Cambridge manuscript was indeed a forgery, Idries remained silent, "which has led some to assume that his manuscript does not exist," according to Seymour-Smith (557). Nonetheless, Graves "remained loyal, if unconvinced of Shah's rightness in withholding the manuscript" (O'Prey 283). After all these years, writes R.P. Graves, "in view of the Shahs' numerous obligations to Graves," it is difficult to believe "that they would have continued to withhold it *had it ever existed in the first place*" (472, Graves's emphasis).

* * *

During the Rubaiyyat controversy, other minor points of friction arose between Graves and Idries Shah. There was an instance when Shah became displeased with Graves for using one of the stories in *Tales of the Dervishes* (1967), "Candy in the River"—"and I know you'll forgive me for the borrowing" (6 December 1967, O'Prey 268)—as the

basis for a children's story, "The Poor Boy Who Followed His Star" (1968). On 26 February 1968, Graves wrote to Shah that the source of the story was being printed with due acknowledgments on the jacket of the book. He mentioned that the only other misunderstanding between them—this was prior to Graves's request for Omar's manuscript—concerned his introduction to *The Sufis*, when Graves was "under the impression that you would at any rate let me proof-read the book for you.... Forgive me! I think you underrated my readiness to help you as a friend, and freely and anonymously, as I help scores of other writers whom I do not value a one thousandth part of my love for you and yours" (O'Prey 269).

Then, that summer, Graves wrote an essay entitled "Genius," published first in *Playboy* (August 1968) and then in *Difficult Questions, Easy Answers* (1972). Shah's notes on the subject arrived too late for Graves to use them in the essay, but he wrote Shah a long letter on 6 September (O'Prey 271-274) to show him he was being far too generous with the word "genius." "I cannot call Napoleon, Alexander the Great, Pericles, or Hitler a genius," he wrote, "because they all ended shamefully and ruined their own countries." Also unfit for the title were: Michaelangelo ("turned from women—genius involves male procreation—to boys"); Hugo ("had immense talents but was no poet"); Napoleon ("a lost artilleryman, who even cheated his washerwoman"); Shaw ("unpardonably vain. Humility and a sense of humour are part of genius"); Tolstoy ("wholly without taste...and a domestic tyrant"); Dostoevsky ("whose works have depressed more young people in England and Russia than any other novelist"); Augustine ("false-hearted, a liar"); Wagner ("an exhibitionist"); and women ("woman parturitates, does not engender, so she has no generative genius"). He concluded: "*Genius* implies *certainty*; *talent* still implies *experiment* and also *doubt*. This is how poets think: in the Irish-Sufic tradition." [Graves's emphases]

* * *

Enlightenment via love and Muse-worship; a peace-loving Black Goddess of wisdom; links to Celtic roots, Druidic rituals and ancient Irish bards; secret esoteric lore transmitted by a teacher; a perennial source for writers throughout history; the divine rapture of baraka: it is little wonder Graves was fascinated with Sufism and with his personal 'guru,' Idries Shah. In a two-page note on Shah's *Tales of the Dervishes* published in Nathaniel P. Archer's *The Sufi Mystery* (1980),

Graves defines "Dervish" as "a Moslem friar of the Sufic way of thought, bound to poverty and good works" (14). He goes on to write that "Dervish teaching largely concerns the danger of accepting conventional thought-patterns, and the need for carefully assessing personal motives.... Dervishes reject as mistaken any concept that fails to pass their test of truth: a truth based on the constant and unselfish exertion of human love and on the power of inspired contemplation" (15). Although no Dervish—yet often bound to poverty more than he wished—Robert Graves, in his often unconventional quest for truth founded on human love, became for a time a devotee of "the Sufic way of thought."

WORKS CITED

- Canary, Robert H. *Robert Graves*. Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1980.
- Graves, Richard Perceval. *Robert Graves and the White Goddess, 1940-1985*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1995.
- Graves, Robert. "Tales of the Dervishes," in Nathaniel P. Archer, *The Sufi Mystery*. London: The Octagon Press, 1980: 14-15.
- . "The Word 'Baraka'," in *On Poetry: Collected Talks and Essays*. Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1969: 359-366.
- Kirkham, Michael. "The Black Goddess of Wisdom," in Bloom, Harold, ed. *Robert Graves: Modern Critical Views*. New York: Chelsea House, 1987: 75-90.
- O'Prey, Paul, ed. *Between Moon and Moon: Selected Correspondence of Robert Graves 1946 - 1972*. 1984. Mount Kisco, New York: Moyer Bell, 1990.
- Plimpton, George, ed. *Writers at Work: The Paris Review Interviews*. Fourth Series. New York: The Viking Press, 1976.
- Quinn, Patrick, ed. *Robert Graves: The Centenary Selected Poems*. Manchester: Carcanet, 1995.
- Seymour, Miranda. *Robert Graves: Life on the Edge*. New York: Henry Holt, 1995.
- Seymour-Smith, Martin. *Robert Graves: His Life and Work*. London: Hutchinson, 1982.
- Shah, Idries. *The Sufis*. Introduction by Robert Graves. 1964. London: The Octagon Press, 1977.