meter, *al-ṭawīl*). As for vocalization, the painstaking work on the colloquial is marvelous. It would, however, have been helpful had some explanations with references been given. For example, in *Brains Confounded* one reads: *aniḍura* (*anẓura*, vol. 1, p. 60, l. 3); *shabbihtuki* (*shabbahtuki*; vol. 1, p. 264, l. 11, an Abū Nuwās quote); *muḥammid* (vol. 2, p. 14, l. 16); *yuḥkum (yaḥkum)*, *ʿalā kalbuhu* (*ʿalā kalbihi*)*,* and *yaddalliʿ* (*yudalliʿ*, vol. 2, p. 16, ll. 16–17); *bi-ishqak* (*bi-ishqik*, vol. 2, p. 248, l. 3); and in *Risible Rhymes* one finds: *riwwiḍī* (*rawwiḍī*, p. 18). In these cases, it is hard to tell whether the irregular vocalization reflects rural pronunciation or is simply a typo.

Speaking of typos, I caught a few and they are all in *Brains Confounded*: vol. 1, p. 40, l. 1, *tanquda* (subjunctive); p. 168, l. 11, *farrāsh* (wrong *i* sign); p. 174, l. 5, *yuballu* (misplaced *shadda*); p. 178, l. 4, *lam yanfaʿka* (jussive); p. 178, l. 5, *bi-fajmatin*; p. 200, l. 3, *idhā shiʾta* (misplaced *sukūn* on *sh*); p. 234, l. 2, *bi-quwwah*; p. 246, l. 19, *wāw* occurs at the end of line; p. 310, l. 5, *fī kaffihi*; vol. 2, p. 8, l. 11, *taʾkhudhīn*; p. 46, l. 5, *qāla* (delete *shadda*); p. 150, l. 7, *min al-ḥabībi*; p. 170, l. 7, *ziyādat* (with *tāʾ marbūṭa*); p. 176, l. 13, *ʿinda ṣabīḥati*; p. 220, l. 12, *ghurābuhā* (delete *ḍamma* on *h*); p. 256, l. 7, *mushʿalatun* (odd *tanwīn* on *h* for *tāʾ marbūṭa*); p. 348, l. 18, *fī al-maqāli*; p. 380, l. 7, *ka-anna mashībahu*.

In sum, the two books are a remarkable achievement in many ways. The significance of the Arabic texts in question lies first and foremost in their unique rural setting, but also in their rich documentation of the vernacular poetry in the Ottoman Arab East, a subject that merits more research in its own right. The history of the publication and reception of and scholarly attention to *Brains Confounded* tells us a great deal about the changing attitudes regarding the definition of *turāth*, Arabic literary heritage, at large. In this connection, it should be pointed out that these two texts first garnered attention among Western scholars; Arab scholars quickly responded with their own probe, appraisal, and publication of *Brains Confounded*, but *Risible Rhymes*, now made available for the first time, has been long neglected in the Arab literary world. The decision to include these two non-canonic texts in the Library of Arabic Literature series makes an interesting and encouraging statement, to say the least.

Lɪ Guᴏ
Uɴɪᴠᴇʀsɪᴛʏ ᴏꜰ Nᴏᴛʀᴇ Dᴀᴍᴇ

Aḥmad Fāris al-Shidyāq, *Leg over Leg*. Edited and translated by Hᴜᴍᴩʜʀᴇʏ Dᴀᴠɪᴇs. 4 vols. Library of Arabic Literature. New York: Nᴇᴡ Yᴏʀᴋ Uɴɪᴠᴇʀsɪᴛʏ Pʀᴇss, 2013–2014. Pp. xl + 365; vii + 443; vii + 393; viii + 571. $125 (set); $40 each.

With this impressive edition and translation, Humphrey Davies has rendered one of the most challenging texts of Arabic literature, al-Shidyāq's *al-Sāq ʿalā l-sāq*, accessible to a wide range of readers for the first time. Most histories of modern Arabic literature mention it, but what they say is generally based on impressions, if only because to read it conscientiously from cover to cover takes weeks or months rather than days. Now an enormous obstacle has been removed from the path of all those wanting to read and study this work.

Following the established format of the Library of Arabic Literature (LAL), the text and the translation on the facing page are preceded by a foreword, here contributed by Rebecca C. Johnson, a specialist in modern Arabic literature. It situates *al-Sāq ʿalā l-sāq* in the general context of the *nahḍa*, the cultural awakening (or *risorgimento*, strictly speaking the equivalent of *nahḍa*) of the Arab world, which is customarily seen as starting in the nineteenth century and centered in Egypt. It outlines the life of (Aḥmad) Fāris al-Shidyāq from his birth in 1805 or 1806 in Lebanon to his death in Istanbul in 1887 and sketches the economic, social, and cultural changes taking place in his time, notably the development of printing. It then turns to *al-Sāq ʿalā l-sāq*, which, with its very diverse types of text, cannot be assigned to any genre, and identifies the two main areas of investigation that the work announces: the Arabic language with its vast riches and women in all their variety. Johnson brings out well the "multi-register and multi-lingual cacophony" of the work. She also discusses its remarkable openness toward women and gender issues, even though she apparently follows Kamran Rastegar in seeing

al-Fāriyāqiyya, the main character's companion, as an abstract "Fāriyāqness" (vol. 1: xxix), rather than as a personal name, the Lebanese dialect feminine form of al-Fāriyāq (as pointed out by Boutros Hallaq, in *Histoire de la littérature arabe moderne*, vol. 1: *1800–1945*, ed. idem and Heidi Toelle [Arles: Sindbad/Actes Sud, 2007], 243).

In a subsequent note, Davies explains the minimal changes to the original 1855 edition that was printed under al-Shidyāq's supervision. Unlike other editors, he has followed it faithfully. Thus, he has retained the order of the chapters and also the orthography, although it does not always conform to current convention. Since there is no readily available complete text of the original Arabic, the editors of LAL might think of publishing the Arabic text separately, as they regularly do with the English translations in the series.

The reader is then plunged into al-Shidyāq's critical, humorous, uninhibited, sometimes bitter but profoundly humane, and utterly original masterpiece. The volumes are all constructed according to the same general scheme: twenty chapters, of which chapter thirteen is a *maqāma*. In the fourth volume, the twentieth chapter, which presents a collection (*dīwān*) of poetry composed by al-Shidyāq in Paris, is followed, however, by a comic letter of apology to a bevy of dignitaries, a list of synonyms found in the book, and three attacks on Parisian teachers of Arabic. These appendices, if that is what they are, have hardly been taken account of in discussions of *al-Sāq* until now, but the questions they raise about the book's form will need to be dealt with.

Each volume is supplied with notes to the translation, a glossary of names and terms, and an index of names, terms, and subjects, which greatly facilitate consultation of the work. Whereas producing the edition was straightforward, the translation presented almost insuperable problems that Davies has solved wisely and elegantly. He explains the principal difficulties of the text and how he has tackled them in the "Translator's Afterword" (vol. 4: 485–94), a model of insight into the process of translation, especially where a premodern Arabic text is concerned.

One difficulty is rhyme. Davies has rendered the rhymed prose (*saj‘*) that occurs extensively in the book sometimes with equivalent rhymes, but at times he has resorted to near rhymes, assonance, and alliteration. Although unable to reproduce all the original rhymes, he has succeeded in conveying much of the force and humor of al-Shidyāq's *saj‘*. For short passages of poetry he has chosen rhymed couplets, but longer ones he has left unrhymed. Here and there a slight change of wording could have made for improved rhythm or maintained a constant linguistic register, but the results are at worst still pleasing and at best brilliant.

Another difficulty is the lists of words (which is the main reason why few people, even among those who have written about *al-Sāq*, have read it from cover to cover). Al-Shidyāq was fascinated by words, and the book is studded with lists generally related to a given subject, only sometimes with explanations. Where these are present, the translator's path is straightforward: to transliterate the headword and translate the explanation. Where there are none, Davies has followed various methods depending on the list's length. He explains that he developed more strategies as the translation advanced. In some cases English has enough synonyms to allow a direct translation; in others where sound is important, the onomatopoeia of the Arabic may be imitated in English words of the same semantic field; in yet others, the longest lists, representation of the semantic subfield has been preferred to lexical equivalence. In his afterword, Davies admits frankly that this is an exploratory translation; he by no means claims to have the last word. His explorations, however, have revealed many valuable finds and with his experience as a translator he has produced a memorable rendering. Moreover, his explanation of how he proceeded will certainly stimulate reflections on the translation of Arabic premodern authors—and even some modern ones enamored of words, like Idwār al-Kharrāṭ.

A few criticisms may be made about the notes and glossary. As Davies points out, al-Shidyāq relied greatly on the fourteenth-century al-Fīrūzābādī's classic dictionary *al-Qāmūs al-muḥīṭ*, and Davies himself often quotes lexicographers' explanations in the notes appended to each volume of the text-cum-translation. At least once the lexicographer has led Davies into error (vol. 2: 425): following al-Fīrūzābādī, he ascribes the building of the palace of al-Jawsaq to al-Muqtadir (r. 295–320/908–32), whereas in fact the two palaces of that name were built by al-Mutawakkil and al-Muʿtaṣim some three-quarters of a century earlier. There are some slips where Eastern Christianity is concerned: the eighteenth-century al-Zabīdī's *Tāj al-ʿarūs*, Davies's probable source for the definition of "the Great

Catholicos" *(al-jāthilīk al-akbar)* as "the leader of the Christians in the lands of Islam, dwelling in Baghdad" is reasonably accurate—in fact, he was the Patriarch of the Nestorians, the largest Christian community in Baghdad—but Davies makes him change community and become "the leader of Eastern Orthodox Christians living under Muslim rule" (vol. 1: 324). Al-Fāriyāq is obliged to become a Market-man temporarily in order to marry al-Fāriyāqiyya, and Market-men are defined (vol. 3: 383) as belonging to the Maronite or Roman Catholic churches, but al-Fāriyāqiyya surely belonged to the Melkite (*rūm kāthūlīk*) community, as did Nāṣif al-Yāzijī (*pace* vol. 3: 384). Although he was known as *shammās* (literally, deacon, but this was also used as a title of respect for men of learning, as he was), ʿAbdallāh Zākhir (vol. 3: 372) was neither a priest nor a member of the Choueirite order, and when the poem where he is mentioned (vol. 3: 302) speaks in the previous line of "the priest of Choueir," it is most likely referring to Rufāʾīl Karāma, member of the order, priest, and historian.[1] (Also, while the printing press that Zākhir established at Choueir was the first in Lebanon to use moveable Arabic type, it was not the first in the Middle East—that was the press set up in Aleppo in 1705.) In this connection one may also note the unfortunate use in Johnson's foreword of "sect" to refer to the Maronite and Coptic communities (vol. 1: xix).

One interesting problem in the translation concerns mid-nineteenth-century fashion. Al-Shidyāq was a leading modernizer of the Arabic language, and many terms that he coined are now thoroughly established. With his interest in women's dress and appearance, he was often led to mention items of clothing, including the *mirfad*. Presumably following Kazimirski ("petit coussin que les femmes emploient pour dissimuler la maigreur ou l'absence des fesses"), Davies renders it as "bustle." The bustle, however, became fashionable in the late 1860s, some years after the publication of *al-Sāq*. What al-Shidyāq is referring to with the *mirfad* is the crinoline, as becomes clear in the passage (vol. 4: 99) where women wearing *marāfid* bend down or bend over and show their backsides. Wearing a bustle would not have the same result. In choosing *mirfad*, al-Shidyāq may well have had in mind another of its meanings, "a large drinking bowl from which two or three persons can drink at the same time," which resembles the shape of a crinoline. Also translated as "bustle" is the term *ʿuẓẓāma* (e.g., vol. 3: 55, along with several types of padding for the breasts) but from the context it must be simply "padding for the backside."

The translation sometimes hesitates between Arabic and English names. For "Barāmikah" (vol. 3: 163 and n. 92) "Barmakids" would have been preferable, while Yūsuf (vol. 3: 93 and note) and Sulaymān (vol. 3: 57 and glossary entry) could surely have become Joseph and Solomon. When Solomon does appear in his English guise (vol. 4: 77), the translation should read "[but for Bathsheba's stratagem] his (sc. David's) son Solomon would not have become king" (*lam yamlik Sulaymānu bnuh*) instead of "Solomon would not have made his son king." Some other slips and misprints could be mentioned, but in a work of this length and difficulty they are inevitable and they do not detract from the overall effect.

Now that the complete text of *al-Sāq* is readily available together with an excellent English version (despite a number of misprints in both), more detailed and probing studies will be possible. These will need to take account of the complexities and ambiguities of the work that, where literary analysis is concerned, start with the title. As Davies observes (vol. 4: 485), this has been understood in two ways—either referring to the attitude adopted by a storyteller sitting cross-legged or suggesting sexual intercourse (cf. the urban slang "leg-over" employed, for instance, in the satirical journal *Private Eye*). He has exploited lesser-known meanings of *sāq* in his ingenious rendering of the subtitle: The Turtle in the Tree. Another allusion has recently been identified, namely, to Q 75(*al-qiyāma*):29: *wa-ltaffati l-sāqu bi-l-sāq*" (and leg is entwined with leg).[2] Might al-Shidyāq in the conclusion (vol. 4: 407) have been harking back to a resurrection, when he announces part two as appearing after the author's death?

---

1. To identify members of the various Eastern Christian communities, the most reliable reference works are still Georg Graf, *Geschichte der christlichen arabischen Literatur*, 5 vols. (Vatican City: Biblioteca apostolica vaticana, 1944–53), and, for the Greek Orthodox and Greek Catholic communities, Joseph Nasrallah, *Histoire du mouvement littéraire dans l'Église melchite du Ve au XXe siècle*, vols. 2–4 (Louvain: Peeters, 1979–1996).

2. Rana Issa, "The Fallibility of Tradition in al-Shidyāq: The Case of Islam," in *A Life in Praise of Words: Aḥmad Fāris al-Shidyāq and the Nineteenth Century*, ed. Barbara Winckler et al. (Wiesbaden: Ludwig Reichert, forthcoming). The translation is by Tarif Khalidi.

Al-Sāq ʿalā l-sāq has very often been read from the point of view of the development of modern Arabic literature; it has been seen as a proto-novel or even "the first novel in Arabic literature" (Raḍwā ʿĀshūr, *al-Ḥadātha l-mumkina: al-Shidyāq wa-l-Sāq ʿalā l-sāq. Al-riwāya l-ūlā fī l-adab al-ʿarabī al-ḥadīth* [Cairo: Dār al-Shurūq, 2009]), and references to European writers such as Laurence Sterne and Rabelais have been made much of. Sterne's typographical inventiveness appears to have inspired the pointing hand of volume two, chapter fifteen, and the book includes references to and even translations of short passages from European authors. Furthermore, al-Shidyāq thoroughly understood and took advantage of the many possibilities offered by printing as opposed to manuscript copying (see Geoffrey Roper, "Fāris al-Shidyāq and the Transition from Scribal to Print Culture in the Middle East," in *The Book in the Islamic World: The Written Word and Communication in the Middle East*, ed. George N. Atiyeh [Albany: State Univ. of New York Press, 1995], 209–31). But his roots in Arabic literary culture went deep and his reading in it was vast. Not for nothing did the Lebanese critic Mārūn ʿAbbūd link his name to those of the great Abbasid authors al-Jāḥiẓ and al-Mutanabbī (as mentioned in Fawwāz Ṭarābulsī and ʿAzīz al-ʿAẓma, *Aḥmad Fāris al-Shidyāq* [London: Riad El-Rayyes, 1995], 411). The most obvious manifestations of this are his poetry, which is traditional in form and style both in the prestigious classical genres and in popular ones (the nine love-songs following the sarcastic and rather obscene "Two titter-making poems" after the account of the wedding [vol. 3: 93–107]), the four *maqāmāt*, and the mixture of prose and verse (*prosimetrum*). But the changes of tone from *jidd* to *hazal* (seriousness to frivolity) and the recourse to *mujūn*—a complex term covering anything from flippancy and frivolity to obscenity and scatology—that are found throughout are also typical of classical Arabic literature. Al-Shidyāq promises to investigate the praiseworthy and blameworthy qualities of women (vol. 1: 14), and the phrase he uses, *al-maḥāmid wa-l-masāwiʾ*, is almost identical to *al-maḥāsin wa-l-masāwiʾ*, a category of classical Arabic prose works. Moreover, he applies this dualistic approach to other subjects, such as the good and bad points of London and Paris (vol. 4: chs. 16, 17, 18). These few links between *al-Sāq* and earlier Arabic literature are enough to show that as well as being passionately involved with the Arabic language, al-Shidyāq was steeped in the Arabic literary heritage; consequently his innovations need to be read against this background. As a result, his place in the history of Arabic literature will no doubt be reinterpreted.

The above remarks merely scratch the literary surface of *al-Sāq*, which can be approached from many other angles, too. This edition—a faithful reproduction of the original printing—and the outstanding English translation open up countless avenues for research into a crucial work of nineteenth-century Arabic literature—neither "modern" nor "classical," but sui generis and pointing in directions later Arabic literature took, or might have taken.

HILARY KILPATRICK
LAUSANNE

Dharmakīrti on the Duality of the Object: Pramāṇavārttika III 1–63. By ELI FRANCO and MIYAKO NOTAKE. Leipziger Studien zu Kultur und Geschichte Süd- und Zentralasiens, no. 5. Berlin: LIT-VERLAG, 2014. Pp. xv + 173. €24,90.

Dharmakīrti (sixth to seventh c. CE), an Indian philosopher who belonged to the Buddhist epistemological tradition, is one of the few names of Indian philosophers that appear on title pages of books. Indeed, he highly influenced the course of philosophy in South Asia and the legacy of his thought continued in Tibet, where his works were accurately translated from the Sanskrit. Tibetan translations were the only sources for accessing Dharmakīrti's ideas up to the 1930s, when, among other documents, Rahula Sāṅkṛtyāyana discovered manuscripts bearing the Sanskrit text of Dharmakīrti's *Pramāṇavārttika* ("Commentary on the *Pramāṇa*[*samuccaya*]," hereafter PV) and the commentaries thereon composed by Prajñākaragupta and Manorathanandin. For many decades his pioneering editions of these three texts (1938, 1938–40, and 1953 respectively)[1] together with Raniero Gnoli's critical edi-

---

1. Unless otherwise indicated, for bibliographical references see the book under review.