

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 mīthlihi 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

dictionaries do not usually distinguish explicitly between common metaphors and one-off expressions.

Ullmann's volume is far more than a list of quotations, for many sections give insight not only into Arabic linguistic idioms but also into literary motifs—for instance, the “stolen glance” in love poetry (pp. 48–81, nos. 160–307). To these sections Ullmann regularly prefixes short but illuminating discussions, placing the motifs in context. Normally, glances from the lover of his beloved are stolen in spite of the chaperone (*raqīb*) or other literary antagonists. Very different from the stolen glance is the “stealing glance,” cast by the beloved who steals the lover's heart or reason (nos. 305–7 and many more in chap. 11). An excursus (pp. 215–21, nos. 857–85) at the end of the book deals with the opposite of the “stolen glance”: the “open look,” most often expressed with forms of the verb *malaʿa l-ʿayn*, literally “to fill one's eye(s).” The association in Islam of stealing with the punishment of amputating the right hand is used in jest by poets, as in a line by al-Šāhib ibn ʿAbbād: “He who steals money has his hand cut off; he who steals poetry should have his ears boxed” (no. 721); this association too is discussed separately (pp. 229–31).

The quotations are overwhelmingly taken from poetry. The few prose examples, not marked as such, are normally easily recognizable. Once or twice, however, I found myself vainly attempting to scan a prose saying as verse.

In a thoughtful epilogue (*Ausblick*, “outlook”) Ullmann recommends a comparative study of expressions such as “stealing a glance,” which is found not only in modern European languages but also in classical Greek (many examples are given), and he points out a few other striking expressions that occur in different languages where there is no apparent dependence, such as “buying a cat in a sack,” as in a verse by Abū l-Faḍl al-Sukkarī al-Marwazī (fl. early fifth/eleventh century): *mā biʿtuka l-hirrata fī l-jirābi*, which is found in many languages including Italian, French, German, and Dutch—and British English as a variant of the more common “buying a pig in a poke.”

The book concludes with indexes of persons, rhymes, and words.

GEERT JAN VAN GELDER  
UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD

---

Muḥammad al-Tūnisī, *In Darfur: An Account of the Sultanate and Its People*. Edited and translated by HUMPHREY DAVIES. Library of Arabic Literature. 2 vols. New York: NEW YORK UNIVERSITY PRESS, 2018. Pp. lvi + 243 (vol. 1), x + 317 (vol. 2). \$40 each.

This two-volume bilingual edition of an early nineteenth-century Arabic account of travel to the Sultanate of Darfur is a work of great beauty and consummate literary and scholarly accomplishment. It represents the experiences of a Tunisian youth, Muḥammad bin ʿUmar al-Tūnisī, who in 1803 undertook a trip from Cairo to Darfur to find his father. When he succeeded, his father transferred the administrative duties he shouldered for Darfur's sultan to him and Muḥammad thus ended up residing in Darfur for eight years. Volume one contains the narrative of the long family history that had brought young Muḥammad's father and grandfather to (what is now) Sudan before him, describes Muḥammad's own trip from Cairo through the desert to Darfur, and chronicles the reigns of the two most recent predecessors of its then ruling sultan. Volume two is an almost encyclopedic description, systematized without being quite systematic, of aspects of Darfur's land and people, including the sultan's court, officials, and customs, as well as the kingdom's language(s), marriage customs, women and women's beauty, flora, fauna, food, currency, disease, magic, and geomancy.

Adding to the plot line of *In Darfur*, however, is that the text was not committed to writing until several decades later, leading in 1845 to the publication of a partial French text, and then in 1850 to a limited-number lithographic Arabic edition. Both resulted from the collaboration between Muḥammad al-Tūnisī and Nicolas Perron, a French medical doctor and Arabist. In the late 1830s both men found themselves employed at the newly established Medical School of Cairo, where al-Tūnisī supervised the translation into Arabic of contemporary French medical and related scientific texts and Perron first taught and then served as director. This was a transformative period in which Egypt, in the wake of the short-lived occupation by Napoleon and under the ambitious leadership of Muḥammad ʿAlī (1805–1848), undertook many projects of purposeful modernization. The translation project of the Medical School was part of this undertaking and played an important role in the development of the Arabic language.

Perron encouraged al-Tūnisī to commit his Darfur stories to writing as part of the Arabic lessons he took with him. This probably involved, as Davies persuasively argues, dictation from written notes by al-Tūnisī, the writing out in Arabic by the Frenchman, the preparation of the lithographic Arabic text by Perron in his own hand, followed by a more or less thorough revision and correction by al-Tūnisī. The element of orality that was part of this genesis is how Davies accounts for some nonstandard features or infelicities of the Arabic in the text, which had led some scholars to even question al-Tūnisī's authorship. Davies puts this matter to rest. “The issue is not whether the text was the work of one of the collaborators to the exclusion of the other,”