

care, and they will be of interest to many scholars. There is no indication I can see that chapter eighty-five brings the work to a close, so I will look forward to further additions to this lengthy critical edition. I commend the editors here for their diligence and the French Institute of Pondicherry for its long-term commitment to the scholarly study of South Indian Śaivism in Sanskrit works.

RICHARD H. DAVIS
BARD COLLEGE

Jaina-Onomasticon. By JOHANNES KLATT. Edited by PETER FLÜGEL and KORNELIUS KRÜPPELMANN. *Jaina Studies*, vol. 1. Wiesbaden: OTTO HARRASSOWITZ, 2017. Pp. 1012. €178.

By comparison with Georg Bühler (1837–1898), Ernst Leumann (1859–1931), and Albrecht Weber (1825–1901), the main pioneers of Jainology as a philological discipline in the West, their contemporary Johannes Klatt (1852–1903) is a less substantial and now near-forgotten figure. Admittedly the present reviewer can recall how as a novice in Jain studies attempting to navigate within the complex lineage histories of the various Śvetāmbara mendicant orders he derived great assistance from a small cluster of articles published by Klatt in the 1890s. But little else seemed to have been produced by that scholar, and as the Jain textual archive became considerably more accessible during the twentieth century and the contribution of Indian and Western scholars of Jainism became progressively more substantial and better informed, Klatt's achievement seemed small-scale, uncreative, and of little more than antiquarian interest. However, with the publication of his *Jaina-Onomasticon* (JO) Klatt now stands revealed as having been responsible for one of the most remarkable biobibliographical reference works in the annals of Indological research.

In a prolegomenon to this edition of JO, which draws upon much hitherto unpublished material (pp. 13–164), Peter Flügel has produced a lengthy and painstakingly researched biography of Klatt, which at the same time contrives to recreate in fascinating detail the intellectual world inhabited by a variety of scholars of Indology in Germany during the final decades of the nineteenth century. After producing under the guidance of Albrecht Weber a doctoral dissertation on the subject of Cāṇakya's maxims, Klatt eventually became a librarian at the Königliche Bibliothek in Berlin, where from 1872–1893 he was primarily responsible for cataloguing and excerpting journals, while conducting private research in his free time. His entire professional career was spent in this environment. Klatt was clearly a classic example of a workaholic, and his relatively

uneventful life descended in melancholy fashion into what seems to have been a nervous breakdown due to mental overexertion and an early death.

Klatt's career at the Königliche Bibliothek coincided with the chance acquisition during the period 1873–1878 of an important collection of Jain manuscripts. Weber turned his prodigious energies to cataloguing, analyzing, and producing lengthy transcripts of this material, effectively providing the foundations of Jainology as a discipline, and Klatt, following in his wake as it were, availed himself of the opportunity to initiate extensive study of Jain monastic history. From 1882 these researches took the form of a massive project to provide a biobibliographical, effectively prosopographical account of the Jain tradition by utilizing as wide a range of manuscript and printed material as was available at that time. When Klatt's health started to weaken in 1892, his friend Ernst Leumann took charge of his literary estate and had the handwritten manuscript of JO bound in eight volumes, which remained in his possession until his death in 1931. These volumes eventually found their way to the University of Hamburg, where they were lodged in the Asien-Afrika-Institut until being entrusted to the present editors of JO for a period of six years.

The edition of JO which has resulted occupies almost 800 pages of the volume under review. Cornelius Krüppelmann, the editor responsible for the philological tasks of transcription and the construction of a bibliography of Klatt's sources, was faced with no easy undertaking. Klatt's handwriting and style of adding information to his manuscript could not have been straightforward to decipher, as can be gauged from the illustrations provided (p. 117). Nonetheless, JO has been fully and successfully retrieved, with Klatt's English text presented in double columns throughout with headwords highlighted and source references clearly signaled. The publication of JO must accordingly be greeted as a remarkable contribution to the history of scholarship and as a memorial to a period when heroic philological feats were carried out by library-bound scholars who never ventured to India.

Yet while it may be one thing to resurrect a lost work of technical scholarship from the nineteenth century, it is quite another matter to urge such a work, no matter how impressive for its time, upon researchers today as a potentially valuable tool for their work on Jainism. Aspects of JO are undoubtedly redundant when viewed from a more recent perspective; for example, the inclusion of the names of characters from Jain scriptural narrative has been superseded by the more detailed information provided in M. L. Mehta and K. R. Chandra's *Prakrit Proper Names* (Ahmedabad, 1970). Furthermore, the extensive referencing of authors, texts, and senior monastic figures, while seldom inaccurate as such, inevitably reflects the constraints and limitations of the material at Klatt's disposal in the 1880s.

On the other hand, an inspection of JO can sometimes afford a degree of clarification of longstanding issues of identification, as in the case of Haribhadrasūri. It is now broadly accepted by scholarship that the name “Haribhadrasūri” relates to two Śvetāmbara intellectuals, one living around the sixth century CE, the other in the eighth century CE. However, attempts in recent years to shoehorn the large number of works attributed to Haribhadrasūri, many often clearly spurious and of later provenance, into these two authorial contexts might have been tempered by reference to JO’s listing of five monks answering to that name who flourished in the twelfth to fourteenth centuries.

Klatt, like Weber, never seems to have laid eyes on a member of the Jain community. He was apparently aware that the modern Jain community was economically prominent in India, but one can only speculate about whether he envisioned any connection between the complex literary and historical legacy he was dissecting and recording with the actuality of Jain experience in the nineteenth century. The weighty book in which his labors on Jain prosopography have finally been enshrined is somewhat daunting in appearance and might not sit comfortably on all study shelves. Yet it contains scholarly riches in abundance for those attuned to its subject matter. JO constitutes a major achievement on the part of both the compiler, Johannes Klatt, and his devoted editors, and it is worthy of a place in every serious Indological library.

PAUL DUNDAS
UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH

Der ver stolhene Blick: Zur Metaphorik des Diebstahls in der arabischen Sprache und Literatur. By MANFRED ULLMANN. Wiesbaden: HARRASSOWITZ, 2017. Pp. 292. €78 (paper).

The title of Manfred Ullmann’s latest book—written, as he tells us in the preface, in his eighty-sixth year and printed, like several of his earlier books, in his clear handwriting—may be translated as “The Stolen Glance: On Stealing as a Metaphor in Arabic Language and Literature.” With it he has made yet another valuable contribution to the study of Arabic lexicography, stylistics, and literature. It opens with a lexicographical and semantic discussion of seven Arabic roots denoting “to steal,” “to rob,” “to despoil,” “to snatch”: *s-r-q*, *kh-l-s*, *s-l-b*, *kh-ṭ-f*, *b-z-z*, *s-l-l*, *kh-r-b* (pp. 15–45), with their derived forms (*saraqa*, *sāraqa*, *istaraqa*; *khalasa*, *khālasa*, *ikhṭalasa*, etc.); 159 numbered quotations are given in evidence. Most of these roots are rather common except for *kh-r-b*, which is used specifically for stealing camels, occurring almost always as an active participle (*khārib*). This does not amount to an exhaus-

tive treatment of the vocabulary of stealing and robbing, or else Ullmann would have mentioned here, for instance, the verbs *nahaba*, “to rob, plunder, loot,” *laṣṣa / talaṣṣaṣa*, “to be or act as a thief (*liṣṣ*),” *nashala*, “to snatch” (cf. *nashshāl*, “pickpocket”), *ṭarra*, “to cut (e.g., a purse), to snatch” (cf. *ṭarrār*, “cutpurse, pickpocket”). Several of these words appear in quotations in the course of the book.

A peculiar case, not mentioned by Ullmann, is *ḥarasa*, normally meaning “to guard” but occasionally “to steal (e.g., a sheep),” according to the lexicographers; a *ḥāris*, therefore, is said to mean “thief” as well as “guard” (see, e.g., Lane’s *Lexicon*). This is a case of irony (*tahakkum*), according to al-Zamakhsharī (*Asās al-balāgha*); it seems to go back, or is at least to be connected, to a hemistich quoted by al-Jāhīz (*Ḥayawān*, 1: 216) and many later sources: *wa-muḥtarasin min mūthlihi wa-hwa ḥārisū*, roughly “Often one should be on one’s guard against someone who is in fact himself a guard,” which reminds one of Juvenal’s *Quis custodiet ipsos custodes?* It also reminds one—as Ullmann has often done—of the need to be on one’s guard when using Arabic dictionaries.

The main part of the book is divided into thirty sections, each dealing with a specific figurative kind of stealing, with altogether some seven hundred numbered examples from premodern poetry and prose, Arabic with German translation, and sources. Among the things that can be stolen or robbed are glances, kisses, the heart, sleep, reason, life, pleasure, and chances. The vocabulary of stealing is also used for eavesdropping (already in the Quran 15:7, said of “devils” who eavesdrop on God’s High Council), for a feint, striking an opponent with lance or sword in an artful, unexpected maneuver, or for anything done stealthily—for instance, smiling or weeping. A special case of theft is plagiarism, which was discussed in great detail by medieval Arabic literary critics and theorists, who coined a range of technical terms for the various forms it may take. Several modern studies deal with this subject; Ullmann’s contribution (pp. 175–83) is to show that poets themselves often mentioned plagiarism in their poetry, even in pre-Islamic times. The terms they used include *saraqa / istaraqa / tasarraqa*; *intahala / tanahhala*; and *ijṭalaba*. Poets may speak of plagiarism using metaphor: Abū Tammām says that “the virgins of his speech,” his original motifs, will be taken as captives after his death (p. 179, no. 708a).

All the preceding metaphors are fairly common also in English or German; there are others in Arabic that do not translate literally. If someone is *masrūq al-ṣawt*, his voice being “stolen,” it means that he has “lost” his voice and is hoarse (no. 667); if someone’s neck is “stolen” (*mustaraq al-ṣunq*), he has a short neck. This example, provided by al-Zamakhsharī with an anonymous line of verse in evidence, is not given by Ullmann and I have not found other instances. Arabic