

Book Review

Ibn al-Muqaffa^c, ‘Abd Allāh Rūzbih b. Dādūya. *Kalīlah and Dimnah: Fables of Virtue and Vice*. Edited by Michael Fishbein; translated by Michael Fishbein and James E. Montgomery. The Library of Arabic Literature (New York: New York University Press, 2022). ISBN 9781479806539. xxxix + 430 pp. \$30 cloth.

Theodore S. Beers
Freie Universität Berlin

(theodore.beers@fu-berlin.de)

The Library of Arabic Literature has added another key title to its catalogue with the publication of *Kalīlah and Dimnah*,¹ edited by Michael Fishbein and translated jointly by Fishbein and James Montgomery.²

There are three main parts of the volume that should be discussed. The first is an introduction by Fishbein (roughly twenty-five pages, including his “Note on the Text”), in which he provides a concise overview of the biography of Ibn al-Muqaffa^c (d. ca. 139/757), the journey of *Kalīlah and Dimna* as a world-literary phenomenon, and noteworthy features of the Arabic text as it is given in the manuscript that represents the basis for this edition. Second, there is the

edition itself, which has been carried out competently and with an honest, realistic perspective on the complicated nature of the codicology and textual history of the Arabic *Kalīlah and Dimna*—the result being a version of the text that meets the standard for general-purpose use and citation. Third, there is the translation by Fishbein and Montgomery, which should immediately become the English translation of choice for this work, supplanting the fine but dated rendition by Wyndham Knatchbull (1819). Taken as a whole, this publication of *Kalīlah and Dimna* provides something close to “one-stop shopping.” The book could be handed to students with little prior contextualization; they could use the introduction to gain a general idea of *Kalīlah*

1. The spelling *Kalīlah and Dimnah* follows the Library of Congress style for the romanization of Arabic. Throughout this review, in cases where the title of the work is used in a general sense—rather than in reference to this edition/translation—it is written according to the IJMES style: *Kalīlah and Dimna*.

2. For the purposes of this review, I will assume that almost everything apart from the translation—for example, the introduction—is to be credited to Fishbein alone.

© 2022 Theodore S. Beers. This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives License, which allows users to copy and distribute the material in any medium or format in unadapted form only, for noncommercial purposes only, and only so long as attribution is given to the original authors and source.

and *Dimna*, after which they would have an Arabic text with facing English translation that facilitates different modes of reading (including for language learning).³

What follows is commentary on, and occasional criticism of, various aspects of this edition/translation. It bears emphasizing that the critical notes below generally relate to complexities and problems of the *Kalīla and Dimna* tradition itself and are not meant to detract from this volume's overwhelmingly positive qualities.

Fishbein's introduction

The first few pages of Fishbein's introduction are devoted to a brief discussion of the life and times of Ibn al-Muqaffa^c, including an explanation of how *Kalīla and Dimna* fits into his oeuvre (much of which has not survived). The goal is not, of course, to add anything to the scholarly literature on Ibn al-Muqaffa^c, but rather to give a basic overview. Fishbein succeeds at this, and he cites a few authoritative works of scholarship—e.g., István Kristó-Nagy's *La pensée d'Ibn al-Muqaffa^c* (2013)—with which an interested reader could dig deeper.

One point in this passage that could perhaps be expanded upon occurs during Fishbein's comparison of *Kalīla and Dimna* to another work of political and ethical instruction by Ibn al-Muqaffa^c, *al-Adab al-kabīr*. In drawing a link between the two books, Fishbein observes, "Although the stories of *Kalīlah and Dimnah* are, on

the surface, entertaining narratives, their underlying purpose ... is didactic" (p. xiv). It would be worth adding that the logic of *Kalīla and Dimna*, whereby serious messages are encoded in tales that are amusing to read, is an early manifestation of an idea that would become central to Arabic *adab* literature: the mixture of *al-jidd wa-l-hazl*, seriousness and jest. Rather than viewing the entertaining aspects of *Kalīla and Dimna* as surface-level features that mask the true purpose of the book, one could treat the two sides as more complementary. Ibn al-Muqaffa^c says as much in his preface (as translated by Fishbein and Montgomery): "Because such a book combined entertainment with wisdom, the wise would study it for its wisdom, and the simple for its value as entertainment; young pupils and others would be delighted to read it and it would be easy for them to memorize. When the young person reached maturity and grew in knowledge, he would ponder what he had memorized—as it had been recorded and inscribed in his heart without his knowing its true nature—and would come to realize that he had acquired a great treasure" (p. 23). There is no question that Fishbein and Montgomery are well acquainted with this dynamic, but it might help readers of the introduction to clarify the interplay of seriousness and jest in *Kalīla and Dimna*, which is part of situating the work in the early history of Arabic *adab*.

3. *Kalīla and Dimna* has long (if not always) been used as an educational text. As Ahmed El Shamsy has shown, the Būlāq press in Cairo, in its first couple decades of operation, was largely *not* focused on printing classical Arabic works. The exceptions that were made tended to be for books that were "basic teaching texts," especially on grammar. There was, however, an 1836 printing of *Kalīla and Dimna*. This is probably an indication of its perceived educational value. See El Shamsy, *Rediscovering the Islamic Classics* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2020), 67–71. It would be only fitting for students of Arabic in our time to continue the tradition of relying on *Kalīla and Dimna*; a side-by-side edition/translation will make this easier than ever.

The next section of the introduction traces the development of *Kalīlah and Dimna* from its origins in the Sanskrit *Pañcatantra*, to the Sasanian-era translation and expansion in Middle Persian, to the landmark Arabic translation by Ibn al-Muqaffaʿ, and beyond. This is a story that has been told numerous times, and one will find no surprises in the overview given by Fishbein. There are, however, a few points that call for further comment.

First, with regard to the older of the two Syriac versions of *Kalīlah and Dimna*—the one translated from Middle Persian—it is worth noting that, although the original (and unique) extant manuscript disappeared in Paris around the turn of the twentieth century, four copies of it had been made for the use of scholars in the 1870s and '80s, and those have survived.⁴ So it is still possible to study the older Syriac *Kalīlah and Dimna* in manuscript (with certain caveats).

Second, after listing the main early translations based on the Arabic of Ibn al-Muqaffaʿ—into Persian, Syriac (again), Old Castilian, Hebrew, and Middle Greek—Fishbein comments, “Each of these translations was made independently from different forms of the text” (p. xvii). This raises a difficult question. What exactly would it mean for each translation to relate to a “different form” of *Kalīlah and Dimna*? It is true that, if one looks at translations from the Arabic into various other languages in the medieval period, one will sometimes notice significant differences that suggest there was no

single “original.” The influential Persian translation (ca. 540/1146) by Abū al-Maʿālī Naṣr Allāh Munshī, for example, follows a chapter order unlike what is typically found in Arabic manuscripts—and also unlike the chapter order used in many other translations, e.g., into Old Castilian (1251 CE). We should pay attention to such indications of the divergent evolution of the underlying Arabic text. But it is by no means easy to draw definitive general conclusions, and there is a risk of overstatement in the claim that each translator was working with a substantially different version of the book (depending on one’s definition of “different”).

Third, in a potential case of understatement, Fishbein observes, “Of the many surviving manuscripts of the Arabic *Kalīlah and Dimnah*, most are relatively late in date.” In fact, as Fishbein specifies in the next paragraph, the earliest extant copy is dated 618/1221—nearly five centuries after the career of Ibn al-Muqaffaʿ. And we have only a handful of manuscripts from the seventh/thirteenth and eighth/fourteenth centuries. It is important, particularly for the benefit of non-specialist readers, to stress just how troublesome the codicology of this text really is.⁵

Fourth, Fishbein mentions that medieval *adab* works that contain quotes from *Kalīlah and Dimna*, such as the *ʿUyūn al-akhbār* of Ibn Qutayba (d. 276/889), offer further evidence that the Arabic *Kalīlah and Dimna* “had ceased to have a single authoritative text” from an early period. This is true to a meaningful extent. Johannes Stephan

4. See the section by Jan J. van Ginkel in Beatrice Gruendler et al., “An Interim Report on the Editorial and Analytical Work of the AnonymClassic Project,” *medieval worlds* 11 (2020): 241–79. It is also worth noting that the text of the older Syriac *Kalīlah and Dimna* was edited on the basis of the nineteenth-century copies, not the original manuscript.

5. Of course, it is often the case with Arabic texts from the early Islamic period that they have survived

of the AnonymClassic project has carried out important research on the “indirect transmission” of textual material from *Kalīla and Dimna* in anthologies and other sources.⁶ Again, however, we should take care when making broad statements. If early *adab* works quote from *Kalīla and Dimna* in ways that reveal variations in the text—and they do—then how remarkable is that? Where do we draw the line between “normal variation” to be expected in the transmission and reception of a text, and a more fundamental differentiation? Also, how can we correct for problems in the codicology of *adab* anthologies themselves, where surviving manuscripts are often fairly late? These are complicated issues that demand circumspection. It should be acknowledged, however, that Fishbein’s overall point is not wrong: the contents of the Arabic *Kalīla and Dimna* must already have varied significantly by the time of Ibn al-Nadīm (d. ca. 385/995), who mentions having seen versions of the book in which multiple chapters are either added or left out.⁷

The next few sections of the introduction, which address the evolution of *Kalīla and Dimna* starting from the *Pañcatantra*, are nicely written. I do not believe that I have seen a clearer or more concise explanation of how the text grew into the form(s) in which it is found in

Arabic. Again, this is based on existing scholarship—Fishbein cites Franklin Edgerton and Carl Brockelmann, among others—but it is an adept synthesis. When he comes to the question of the prefatory chapter to *Kalīla and Dimna* in which the Iranian physician Burzūya gives his (purported) autobiography, Fishbein notes that scholars have debated whether its origins lie in the Middle Persian translation, or whether Ibn al-Muqaffa^c authored the chapter himself. Fishbein more or less accepts the view of Theodor Nöldeke that some version of this chapter was probably found in the Middle Persian—though it is still possible that Ibn al-Muqaffa^c made additions and changes to it. It would be worth adding here that Burzūya’s autobiography continues to attract scholarly attention as a commentary on general ideas about religion written in (or translated into) Arabic in the early Islamic period. One recent study, which probably appeared just too late to be included in Fishbein’s bibliography, is by Rushain Abbasi.⁸

Perhaps the most important part of Fishbein’s introduction—and definitely the most original—is the discussion of what he terms “Islamic elements” that have been woven into the text of *Kalīla and Dimna* in the (ca. ninth/fifteenth-century) manuscript that serves as the basis for

in much later copies (if at all). What makes *Kalīla and Dimna* unusually challenging is a combination of factors: the popularity and influential status of the work; the apparent freedom felt by copyists to make changes, both large and small; and, yes, the several-century gap between the initial authorship of the text and the production of the oldest extant manuscripts.

6. For an introduction to this topic, see the section by Johannes Stephan in Gruendler et al., “An Interim Report.”

7. See Dagmar Riedel, “*Kalīla wa Demna* i. Redactions and circulation,” *Encyclopaedia Iranica Online*, https://dx.doi.org/10.1163/2330-4804_EIRO_COM_10658.

8. Rushain Abbasi, “Islam and the Invention of Religion: A Study of Medieval Muslim Discourses on *Dīn*,” *Studia Islamica* 116 (2021): 1–106.

this edition. Fishbein shows how the book is given a subtly different flavor through the insertion of references to *Allāh ta'ālā* or *Allāh subḥānahu wa-ta'ālā*; the use of phrases like *in shā'* *Allāh* in dialogue; and references to, e.g., relying on the help of God to navigate a difficult situation. In one touching example, a pair of doves are discussing a plan to save extra grain for the upcoming dry season, and one of them says, "What a good idea! That's what we'll do, *in shā'* *Allāh ta'ālā*" (pp. 342–43). These religious flourishes are not found in the earliest extant manuscripts of the Arabic *Kalīla and Dimna*, such as the one used for the edition of 'Abd al-Wahhāb 'Azzām.⁹ As Fishbein notes, there are other versions of *Kalīla and Dimna* that are set in a still more explicitly Islamic context, with quotes from Qur'anic verses and *aḥādīth*. We could point to, for example, the sixth/twelfth-century Persian translation by Naṣr Allāh Munshī. What is striking about the base manuscript of this edition is that it presents the "original" Arabic *Kalīla and Dimna*, in a gently changed form that shows how the stories might be read in a mature Islamicate milieu. This section of the introduction represents new research and could be expanded into a journal article.

Map of *Kalīla and Dimna* versions

Between the introduction and the "Note on the Text" that follows it, Fishbein has inserted a map titled "Principal Translations of the Arabic *Kalīlah wa-Dimnah*." This will probably be useful to many readers as a visual aid, but, upon examining it in detail, I was puzzled by a

few aspects. In general, it can be difficult to use a map to show a combination of geographical breadth and change over time. The versions of *Kalīla and Dimna* that are plotted here stretch from Toledo to Agra geographically, and from the fourth/tenth to the tenth/sixteenth century chronologically. The languages included are Persian (several times), Greek (twice), Spanish, Hebrew, Latin, and Ottoman Turkish. Some of the versions are not, in fact, direct translations from the Arabic—so the content of the map goes beyond what may be suggested by its title. For example, the Persian version that is plotted at Konya and dated ca. 641–62/1244–63 refers to a versification by the poet Qānī'ī Ṭūsī, made on the basis of the prose text of Naṣr Allāh Munshī. The Ottoman Turkish version placed on the map—i.e., the *Hümāyūn-nāme* of 'Alī Vāsi' Çelebi (d. 959/1543–44)—is based on the *Anvār-i suhaylī*, a Persian rewriting by Ḥusayn Vā'iz Kāshifī (d. 910/1504–5). One could also ask why later Arabic renditions of *Kalīla and Dimna* have not been included. If Persian versifications are fair game—the map has two—then why not add the well-known Arabic versification by Ibn al-Habbāriyya (d. ca. 509/1115)?

It may be that the primary purpose of such a map is to impress upon the reader that there are many translations and adaptations of *Kalīla and Dimna*, in various languages, produced across much of the *oikouménē* over a period of several centuries. Insofar as that is the case, this map is a clear success. If, on the other hand, there were a goal of plotting the descendants of the Arabic *Kalīla and*

9. 'Abd Allāh b. al-Muqaffa', *Kitāb Kalīla wa-Dimna*, ed. 'Abd al-Wahhāb 'Azzām (Cairo: Maktabat al-Ma'ārif, 1941).

Dimna in a relatively comprehensive and fastidiously accurate manner, then various questions could be raised.

Notes on the text

In the last introductory section before the text itself, Fishbein explains the process underlying the edition and translation. He notes that it would hardly be sensible to attempt a composite critical edition based on a group of manuscripts. The variation among extant copies is too great, too fundamental—not to mention their general lateness. We will never have an *Urtext* of the Arabic *Kalīla and Dimna*. A more difficult question is how to choose a manuscript, or a small group of manuscripts, for an edition, after acknowledging that there is no ideal option. Both Louis Cheikho (1905) and ‘Abd al-Wahhāb ‘Azzām (1941) prioritized using the oldest copies that were available to them—even if this led to a greater need for emendation owing to lacunae and other problems with the text.

Fishbein has chosen a different approach. For one thing, it seems that he was (understandably) disinclined to retread the paths of earlier editors. Rather than going back to, e.g., the 618/1221 Ayasofya manuscript used by ‘Azzām, Fishbein selected a copy that is somewhat later; is almost complete (with only minor lacunae at the beginning and end); and was written cleanly by a scribe who seems to have had a reasonably good command of classical Arabic. The manuscript in question is Or. 4044 at the British Library. It is worth looking at the catalogue entry for this manuscript, by Charles Rieu.¹⁰ Fishbein has not cited it directly, though he does include

Rieu’s *Supplement* in the bibliography. As it turns out, this is a codex that contains two texts. It has *Kalīla and Dimna* at fols. 1–135 and, at fols. 136–207, the *Sulwān al-muṭā‘ fī ‘udwān al-atbā‘* of Ibn Ḥafar al-Ṣiqillī (d. ca. 565/1170)—a “mirror for princes” work that brings together various anecdotes, wisdom sayings, and more. (The *Sulwān* pairs nicely with *Kalīla and Dimna*; it would also be a good match for *al-Adab al-kabīr*.) It is not clear whether the copies of these books were produced in the same context, or how they came to be bound together. Judging from high-resolution images, however, the grain of the paper, the handwriting, and the art style appear quite similar. Both texts feature a number of illustrations, though they are found more frequently in *Kalīla and Dimna* than in the *Sulwān*. It may have been on the basis of the paintings that Rieu placed this manuscript approximately in the tenth/fifteenth century, despite the lack of a dated colophon. In any case, for Fishbein’s purposes, this represents a good, middle-of-the-road copy of *Kalīla and Dimna*. It is neither early nor very late; it was evidently produced with care; and it has not been used for previous editions. Philologically inclined readers may wish that more space had been given to the description of the manuscript. (The presence of the *Sulwān al-muṭā‘*, for example, is not mentioned.) But it is possible that, in keeping with the conventions of the Library of Arabic Literature series, technical discussion has been limited to meet the needs of a diverse readership.

Given that Or. 4044 is defective in certain passages, and that there is always

10. See Charles Rieu, *Supplement to the Catalogue of the Arabic Manuscripts in the British Museum* (London: British Museum, 1894), 731–32, no. 1156.

a need to consult multiple copies at points where the text is unclear, Fishbein has made reference to a few other manuscripts of *Kalīla and Dimna*, as well as to earlier editions by ʿAzzām, Cheikho, and others. He follows a hierarchy whereby Or. 4044 is the base manuscript; then, where necessary, he has drawn from two other copies;¹¹ and, when all else fails, he cites further manuscripts and editions. Readings from any source apart from Or. 4044 are indicated in footnotes. This framework seems reasonable and should be simple enough for the reader to understand.

Fishbein also discusses his strategy with regard to normalizing the Arabic text. He claims not to have forced everything to agree with (what we think of as) standard orthography and classical Arabic grammar. Nor, by any stretch of the imagination, has he produced a diplomatic edition. Fishbein refers to the approach that he has taken as a compromise. Dots are often missing from letters in the manuscript; they are always included in the edited text. Various forms of *hamza* are written here according to the modern convention, though they are rarely marked at all in the manuscript. According to Fishbein, in contrast to such matters of orthographic consistency, any normalization that has syntactic implications is footnoted. (We will return to this question shortly.)

Finally, there is a brief note on the English translation, emphasizing that Fishbein and Montgomery have aimed

at a “natural style.” This is true, and perfectly acceptable. The translation will be discussed below.

Edition

There is no way to review the entirety of an edition of a text as substantial as *Kalīla and Dimna*. The best that one can do is to compare select passages to the base manuscript in order to gauge whether the work has been done with attention to detail and in accordance with the criteria laid out in the introduction. The short answer, for this edition, is that it looks good. The text is clean and matches what is found in Or. 4044, allowing for the aforementioned normalization and setting aside cases where recourse has been made to another manuscript or edition.

It may be useful to go through one passage and list the changes that are visible from the manuscript to the edited text. For this I have chosen “The Ascetic and the Guest,” a short chapter that falls near the end of the book. (In fact, it is the last chapter in Or. 4044, though it is not so in all manuscripts.)

The first difference that I noticed, on fol. 134v (p. 396 in the edition), is a correction of the verb *yataʿaddā* (ending in *alif*) to *yataʿaddā* (with an *alif maqṣūra*). This is simply orthographic and, per the standard outlined by Fishbein, need not be noted. Next, on the same folio/page, the phrase *fa-yaṣīr ḥayrānan* (or *ḥayrānā*; the *tanwīn al-faṭḥa* is not marked) has

11. The two secondary manuscripts are Or. 8751 (dated 799/1397) at the British Library and MS 3655 at the Royal Library of Morocco (in Rabat), which is thought to have been produced in the seventh/thirteenth century. The date of Or. 8751 is given by Fishbein as 799/1396, based on a description of the manuscript by François de Blois. As it turns out, de Blois gives the full colophon date as 1 Jumādā al-Ūlā 799 and then equates it to January 1396. This is probably a typographical error. The year 799 AH started in October 1396 CE, but most of it (including Jumādā al-Ūlā) fell in 1397. See de Blois, *Burzōy's Voyage to India and the Origin of the Book of "Kalīlah wa Dimnah"* (London: Royal Asiatic Society, 1990), 66–67.

been corrected to *fa-yaṣīr ḥayrān*, since *ḥayrān* is diptote. Here I might have expected a footnote, but none is given. Next, the verb *daʿá* is corrected to *daʿā*. Next (and still on fol. 134v, p. 396), the short vowels are marked for the word *ṭurfa* in the manuscript, but omitted in the edition. This raises a question of the appropriateness of *removing* detail that is given in the manuscript, which might be seen as more objectionable than *adding* detail that is lacking, such as dots on letters. Next, an unclear word is replaced with *qilla* from another manuscript. This is properly footnoted.

Next, on fol. 135r (still p. 396 in the edition), what appears to be the word *taʿlīm* has been read instead as *taʿallum*, in a context in which the latter makes more sense. A footnote is provided. Next, on the same folio (but now on p. 398),¹² the phrase *fa-ṣāra ḥayrān mutaraddid* is corrected to *fa-ṣāra ḥayrān mutaraddidan*, since *mutaraddid* is *not* diptote. Again, there is no note. Next, the word *lā* is read as *allā* (i.e., the contraction of *an lā*), as found in the editions of Cheikho and ʿAzzām. This may be a case of overcorrection, but it is footnoted. Next, *tadbīr* is corrected to *tadbīran* in an adverbial context, without a note. Next, the words *ilā baʿḍ* are added, with reference to multiple other editions, to complete a “*min baʿḍ...*” construction.

Next, on fol. 135v (still p. 398 in the edition), the word *fī* is added for clarity, based on another manuscript. Finally, the phrase *taḍyīʿ li-l-ḥazm* is inserted, on the same basis. And the chapter comes to a close.

Hopefully the example of this short section is sufficient to give a sense of Fishbein’s editorial practices. There is some normalization, though only to a modest degree (by the standards of Arabic literature scholarship). Where a sentence might be unclear, Fishbein occasionally makes a small change or adds a word or two, drawing on his other sources. The edition is overall close to its base manuscript. Again, I have not scoured the whole text, and it may be that a detail-oriented reader will find the odd nit to pick.

PDF of the edition

In accordance with its normal policy, the Library of Arabic Literature has made the edited text of *Kalīlah and Dimnah* freely available in digital form. This is commendable. I do think it is worth noting, however, that the PDF file that they have published is unusable for searching in the text. It contains textual data that does not correspond to the words on the page. I assume that this is related to some technical limitations in their typesetting process. It would be much better if, in the future, the publisher found a way of providing the Arabic text of their editions in a format suitable for searching and computational analysis. In the era of digital humanities, that would be an even greater gift to the field.

Translation

Of the major components of this volume, the English translation is the one about which—in a positive sense—I have

12. We have “skipped” here from p. 396 to 398 because this is a side-by-side edition/translation, with Arabic text on even pages and English on odd pages. The numbering runs continuously, so that, for example, the Arabic on p. 396 corresponds to the translation on p. 397.

the least to say. Fishbein and Montgomery have translated *Kalīlah and Dimna* just as is indicated in the introduction. The prose is clear and not too formal. The Arabic text is represented faithfully enough, but not in a way that hampers the readability of the translation. After all, the Arabic is always on the facing page, and every paragraph is numbered, so that there can be no doubt as to the concordance on the level of a sentence. The standard that should be met, from my perspective, is that a student of Arabic language and literature should be able to use the translation for help in parsing a difficult passage in the original. As far as I have seen, Fishbein and Montgomery's rendering of *Kalīlah and Dimna* would certainly allow for this. It will also be an easy and enjoyable read for those who are interested only in the English.

Concluding thoughts

This volume does include some back matter. First, there are occasional notes for the translation—sixty-six in total, across the entire book. These are mostly intended for clarification based on subtleties in the meaning of Arabic

phrases, or to comment on points that are unclear in the manuscript. Second, there is a short glossary of names and terms. Third, Fishbein and Montgomery have provided a bibliography, which is of modest length but helpful. Fourth, and perhaps more importantly, there is a passage on “further reading,” which calls attention to scholarship (some of it quite recent) on different aspects of *Kalīlah and Dimna*.¹³ Fifth, and finally, we are given an index of proper nouns.

As was stated at the outset, this edition/translation, along with its introduction and other resources, will give many readers everything that they need to study *Kalīlah and Dimna*. One last question to address is whether Fishbein's edition can *replace* other published versions of the text, such as that of ‘Azzām. The answer, realistically, is “probably not.” Given the foundational problems with the textual history of the Arabic *Kalīlah and Dimna*, those who wish to engage in close reading will continue to need to consider a range of versions, in both print and manuscript. Thanks to Fishbein, we now have another high-quality published option, but—as he has freely acknowledged—there is no universal solution.¹⁴

13. Two of the noteworthy and fairly new articles that are included are Christine van Ruymbeke, “*Kalīlah and Dimna* as a Case-Study: Ibn al-Muqaffa's and Nasrullah Munshi's Translations,” in *The Routledge Handbook of Arabic Translation*, ed. Sameh Hanna, Hanem El-Farahaty, and Abdel-Wahab Khalifa, 253–69 (New York: Routledge, 2020); and Matthew L. Keegan, “‘Elsewhere Lies Its Meaning’: The Vagaries of *Kalīlah and Dimna*'s Reception,” *Poetica* 52 (2021): 13–40.

14. Complementary to this edition is the work of the AnonymClassic project at the Freie Universität Berlin, which has sought to build a large corpus of manuscripts of *Kalīlah and Dimna* and to develop a digital platform that facilitates juxtaposing their contents. This effort represents another response to the impossibility of a single solution, i.e., by offering a multitude of partial solutions.