

to offer all possible reasonable Iranian etymologies for further consideration. Not every one can, nor apparently should, be taken as more than a possibility. From other parts of the world we know that very many place-names defy all etymologies and that names for which ancient sources offer quite a different form may treacherously resemble words in a modern language. The same certainly holds true with ancient names.

Thus there are many cases that arouse my suspicion, but given this method I wonder how much I can say. For instance, it is a well-known fact that, before the Muslim conquest, Buddhism also flourished in the area that now consists of Eastern Iran, Afghanistan, and western Central Asia. Accordingly, the book contains no less than five names for which OIA *śramaṇa* / MIA *samaṇa* is given as the possible origin: Thamaṇai (p. 13, Hdt 3, 117), Asmanoi (p. 44, Ptol. 6, 14, 9), Samnitai (p. 47, Ptol. 6, 14, 10), Rhabannai (p. 51, Ptol. 6, 16, 5), and Rhamnai (p. 68, Ptol. 6, 21, 4). Certainly not all of these are Buddhist, but the possibility exists for further consideration.

There are several other cases where I find their suggestions unlikely, but the same principle applies in these, too. Thus, for instance, the name Derbikkai is so well attested, not only in Ptolemy 6, 10, 2, but also in Stephanus of Byzantium, and as Derbikes in Ktesias (Photius) and Strabo (11, 11, 8), that it is difficult to take *Dribyses/Dribices* of Pliny (who is notoriously careless with foreign names) as a better reading and therefore connect it with Avestan *driḥika* (p. 34). For Oxydrankai (Sogdian people in Ptolemy, p. 42) a comparison to the Indian Oxydrakai of Alexander literature is missing. The same applies to Sydroi (p. 65), corresponding to Sydrakai of Strabo. Saitianoi (p. 47) is derived from “Skt. *caitya*- ‘Stūpa’,” but *caitya* is a monks’ meeting hall, though often containing a *stūpa*. Bautai (p. 50) in Sērikē could correspond to Tibet’s Sanskrit name *bhoṭal bhauṭa*, but the latter is only attested many centuries later and derived from Tibetan *bod*.

In connection with Ptolemy’s Paropanisadai (6, 18), there is a note on Kaspapyros/-tyros of Hecataeus and Herodotus (p. 59) suggesting the old idea of Henning and others that it is the same as Paskiboura / *pškbwr* and refers to Peshawar/Puruṣapura, but Peshawar was founded only centuries later in the Kushan period (cf. my *India in Early Greek Literature*, Helsinki: Finnish Oriental Society, 1989, 42ff.). In the same connection I have also expressed my doubt about equating Herodotean Paktyes (here p. 60) with modern Pashtu.

It is a well-known tendency of Ptolemy to give the same place-names to different, but often nearby locations. This is duly noted here (p. 25), but some further parallels could have been added from book 7 (India). Now, at least, one working with the Indian part can benefit from the present analysis of Iranian and Central Asian material contained in book 6.

There are some technical problems. For Herodotus and for the general discussion on Ptolemy, the paragraphs are numbered: 1., 1.1., 1.2., etc., but in the detailed part of Ptolemy, from p. 29, similar numbers

printed in bold style refer to Ptolemy’s chapters. All Greek names are given both in the original and in transliteration (longer quotations occasionally only in transliteration, see 3.1.). This is apparently intended for ease of use (although I suppose most of the intended readers can read Greek), but it causes another kind of difficulty. With the letter x the reader must understand, whether the name is Greek (x = ks) or Iranian (x = ḥ).

Even if occasionally somewhat far-fetched, the ideas offered are often interesting. I have always accepted Alexandria Eschate as a pure Greek name, the farthest Alexandria, related to Kyreschate, but here (p. 40) the possibility of its being related with the Iranian *xšāθr*-‘rule/land/city’, interpreted using Greek popular etymology, is worthy of serious consideration. A careful study offers many other similarly interesting cases.

KLAUS KARTTUNEN
UNIVERSITY OF HELSINKI

Bibliotheca Malabarica: Bartholomäus Ziegenbalg’s Tamil Library. Edited and translated by WILL SWEETMAN with R. ILAKKUVAN. École française d’Extrême-Orient, Collection Indologie 119. Pondicherry: INSTITUT FRANÇAIS DE PONDICHÉRY and ÉCOLE FRANÇAISE D’EXTRÊME-ORIENT, 2012. Pp. 153. €17.

Bartholomäus Ziegenbalg, Pietist Lutheran missionary educated at Halle and commissioned by the Danish king, arrived at the Danish enclave of Tranquebar (Tarangambadi), South India, in July of 1706, and shortly set about learning Tamil. His daily regimen was to begin the day, at seven, with an hour going over new words and phrases written down by his scribe from the previous day’s study; then, till noon, reading works new to himself in the presence of an “old poet,” a seventy-year-old schoolmaster, who explained them; from three to five in the afternoon, reading the works of individual authors; and after dark, from six thirty to eight, having read to him, “often a hundred times,” works of authors whose style he admired and sought to imitate. Assiduously collecting Tamil manuscripts, two years later he had a substantial library and wrote an account in German of Tamil literature, the *Bibliotheca Malabarica*, and had written three short works in Tamil in addition to letters and sermons.

In this volume Will Sweetman translates and annotates the section of the *Bibliotheca Malabarica* that deals with Hindu and Jain works, 119 in all (other sections cover Protestant, Catholic, and Muslim works). It is a valuable contribution to the body of works on Tamil manuscripts and libraries, of which there remains so much more to know. He is modest about its contribution, as Ziegenbalg’s library had no works of the Sangam period, and lacked many medieval works of central importance. It was far from representative. But every bit

of knowledge about the availability of particular works at a particular time is a gain.

Ziegenbalg went on to write other works in German explaining Hinduism to Europeans, notably *Malabarisches Heidentum* (1711) and *Genealogia der malabarischen Götter* (1713), and, in Tamil, works of apologetics and a translation of the Bible, unfinished at his death in 1719, revised (and superseded) by the translation of Johannes Fabricius.

The prevailing European classification of religions at the time was Bible-centered and had four categories at varying distances from sacred scripture: Judaism, Christianity, Islam, and heathenism. Hinduism fell into the last category of heathenism, for Ziegenbalg and for other Europeans of his time. But as Sweetman shows, while he arrived in South India with a strong presentiment that he would encounter barbarism, he was pleasantly surprised to find very quickly that the Tamils were intelligent and rational people, a view strongly reinforced as he learned to read their writings.

When at last I was entirely able to read their own books, and became aware that the very philosophical disciplines as are discussed by scholars in Europe are quite methodically taught among them, and also that they have a proper written law from which all theological matters must be derived and demonstrated; all this astonished me greatly, and I developed a very strong desire to be thoroughly instructed in their heathenism from their own writings. (pp. 4–5)

It is his exploration of Malabar heathenism that most attracts Sweetman to this early text, more than its value in reconstructing the history of Tamil literature. Even on that matter existing assessments vary widely, from highly positive (Kamil Zvelebil) to minimizing (Hans-Werner Genischen). The problem is that “scholars of Tamil literature have for the most part been relatively uninterested in Ziegenbalg’s pioneering efforts, and historians of missions have lacked sufficient knowledge of Tamil literature to make an accurate assessment of them” (p. 2). The difficulty of truly coming to terms with pioneer texts of this kind will be evident, and Sweetman’s solution is to collaborate with R. Ilakkuvan, a scholar of classical Tamil.

The steady tendency of this fine, short but essential work is to show in great detail the universe of Tamil works upon which Ziegenbalg drew in his later, major expositions of Hinduism in South India for European readers. The real project of the book is to continue the examination of Ziegenbalg’s growing knowledge and appreciation of Hinduism. On the way we also get a valuable increment of knowledge about the history of Tamil literature.

THOMAS R. TRAUTMANN
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Essays in Arabic Literary Biography, 925–1350. Edited by TERRI DEYOUNG and MARY ST. GERMAIN. *Mîzân: Studien zur Literatur in der islamischen Welt*, vol. 17,1. Wiesbaden: HARRASSOWITZ, 2011. Pp. vii + 371. €68.

This is the first volume of a three-volume series whose general editor is Roger Allen. For each volume forty authors are selected from a particular period of Arab literary history, organized in a newly devised periodization, namely, 950–1350, 1350–1850, and 1850–1950. (Another volume on an earlier period was published independently—*Arabic Literary Culture 500–950*, ed. Shawkat Toorawa and Michael Cooperson [Detroit: Thompson Gale, 2005].) This new periodization is said to reflect cultural and intellectual changes in Arab literary history better than the traditional one based on political and dynastic changes. For each volume invited specialized scholars contribute independent literary biographies on the authors selected.

Each essay begins with a list of the selected author’s works, followed by a list of editions and then a list of translations, and it ends with references. Arranged alphabetically by the authors’ last names, the essays differ in length and, in this volume, may be as short as two and a half pages (e.g., on Rūzbihān Baqlī) or as long as twenty-one (e.g., on Ibn al-‘Arabī). They also differ in approach, in depth and breadth, and, of course, in style; but they are all informative and some, really erudite.

As the two editors explain in their excellent eleven-page introduction, the three centuries of this period were centuries of great creativity in many ways. Despite the political fragmentation of the time, literary production continued under rival patrons in a vast Islamic domain extending from the Iberian Peninsula to North Africa and the Eastern Mediterranean lands, and reaching Arabia and the plateaus of Iran and Afghanistan.

This period saw the flourishing of Arabic poetry based on earlier classics, the addition of new poetic genres like strophic verse and vernacular verse, and the rise of new prose genres like the narrative picaresque and the popular shadow play. The period also witnessed the development of literary criticism and the study of Arabic rhetoric; the growth of religious, mystical, and philosophical writings; the production of travel and historical literature, and of compendia of past Arab literary achievements and bibliographical sources for them.

To select forty authors from this extensive literary production is a daunting exercise, but the editors have chosen well. One of the editors, Terri DeYoung, wrote on eleven of them and the other, Mary St. Germain, wrote on three; the remaining twenty-six of the forty authors were dealt with by others, with one essay to each except for five authors who wrote two apiece: Gabriel Skoog (Abū l-Faraj al-Iṣbahānī, Ibn Sanā’ al-Mulk); Ali Hussein (al-Qāḍī al-Jurjānī, Qudāma ibn Ja’far); Jaakko Hämeen-Anttila (Badī’ al-Zamān al-Hamadhānī, al-Ḥarīrī); Firoozeh Papan-Matin (‘Ayn