

Reviews

Nachgelassene Schriften: 1. Ein westtocharisches Ordinationsritual. 2. Eine dritte tocharische Sprache: Lolanisch. By KLAUS T. SCHMIDT. Edited by STEFAN ZIMMER. Monographien zur Indischen Archäologie, Kunst und Philologie, vol. 24. Bremen: HEMPEN, 2018. Pp. xiv + 275. \$75.

As the title says, this book consists of two works from the Nachlass of K. T. Schmidt (1932–2017). The first is his 1986 Habilitationsschrift from Saarbrücken on the Kuchean (West Tocharian, Tocharian B) Karmavācanā, and the second is an account of his claim that a set of undeciphered documents from the northern rim of the Tarim Basin contains a third branch of Tocharian written in a peculiar form of Kharoṣṭhī script.

It is complicated to assess this book for a variety of reasons that should become clear below. It undoubtedly contains much that is useful, and Zimmer should be applauded for the sizable task of shepherding this complex material into print. The Habilitationsschrift contains the longest continuous Tocharian text now known, part of which is a useful parallel with the Tumshuqese Karmavācanā. This review mostly considers the Habilitationsschrift and its relevance to Tumshuqese. I begin with a few paragraphs about the second work.

Lolanisch. The claims in this book about evidence for Tocharian C, “Lolanisch,” in Kharoṣṭhī documents from Xinjiang are now infamous. Zimmer was correct to note that the claims would constitute a scholarly sensation (p. 163), and in fact soon after publication a meeting of Tocharologists and Kharoṣṭhī scholars dedicated to these claims was held in Leiden, September 15–16, 2019. We can probably expect statements from these experts soon, but it appears that the consensus is negative (<https://languageglog ldc.upenn.edu/nll/?p=44503>). In the meantime, without going into detail about the script, language, and content of the documents, I offer some reasons why one should be cautious about claims of decipherment and evidence for Tocharian C.

Red flag 1. These documents are in an unknown language and script (called Kharoṣṭhī type A by Schmidt). Cases like these are usually only successfully deciphered through the use of bilingual materials. For Egyptian hieroglyphics there was the Rosetta Stone, and for Tangut there were the Chinese–Tangut glossary and the transcriptions of Tangut in Tibetan script. In contrast, the language and script of the famous Phaistos Disk still defy decipherment in spite of many ambitious claims over more than a century.

Red Flag 2. Schmidt proposes that the texts contain the place name Lolam and that this name is derived from Chinese Loulan, an ancient kingdom on the lake Lop Nor in Xinjiang. It has long been well understood that the Chinese name is borrowed from the local endonym Krorāina, known from Prakrit texts found in the region. As Schmidt points out, Lóulán 樓蘭 was pronounced something like *ɣlau-lan in the second century BC and was a transcription of the local name. But if these texts are in the language of Krorāina, one would assume that the place name itself would also be in the local language. It makes no sense that the place would be referred to by an exonym, in this case the name used by the Chinese.

Red Flag 3. There are also documents from Kucha in Gāndhārī Prakrit and Kharoṣṭhī script (called type B by Schmidt), although these appear to be not well-understood local variants of this language and script (Hitch 2009: 14–15 and n. 45). If these identifiably Kharoṣṭhī documents offer significant challenges in reading, then the script(s) associated with Lolanisch should have even greater doubts as to their reading.

I leave a proper analysis of Schmidt’s linguistic and script claims to the experts. But I will note that this work has the great value of assembling all known documents of this type and presenting this evidence to a greater audience. And Zimmer is to be congratulated for the significant task of publishing

images of all the documents. These contributions should be recognized and not overshadowed by what seem to be over-ambitious claims of decipherment.

Karmavācanā. I have waited thirty-three years to see Schmidt's 1986 Habilitationsschrift in print. In 1985 I completed a new transcription of the then known Tumshuqese materials including the Karmavācanā (available on researchgate.net) and was aware of problems in interpretation (cf. Emmerick 1985: §9.2, §15.3). I met Schmidt in 1986 at Emmerick's residence in Quickborn as we were all attending an ICANAS conference in Hamburg. Schmidt showed that the Kucheian version of the Karmavācanā, which formed the main part of his Habilitationsschrift, was a close parallel to the Tumshuqese and that it illuminated several points in the interpretation of the Tumshuqese. This was an exciting development. It seemed we might have something like a Rosetta Stone to help in the decipherment of the Tumshuqese documents, which, apart from a tiny piece from a Buddhist book, were civil contracts. One short article with several tantalizing details appeared quickly (Schmidt 1988), but a methodical comparison of the parallel texts with detailed grammatical comment on the Tumshuqese did not appear in Schmidt's lifetime.

Tocharologists were also eager to see this work, and photocopies of the original typescript have apparently been in circulation for some time. The Kucheian text was posted on TITUS in 2007 under the new signatures THT 1102–1125 (<http://titus.fkidl.uni-frankfurt.de/texte/tocharic/thtind11.htm>). An English translation, based on Schmidt's work, was published by T. Tamai in 2014. But these efforts do not eliminate the need for Schmidt's edition. Images of the manuscripts have been on TITUS for some time, and so the second volume of the Habilitationsschrift with manuscript images is not included in the *Nachgelassene Schriften*.

Chapter I is a well-constructed introduction to the editing work and its results. Based partly on earlier efforts by D. Schlingloff on this birchbark manuscript, Schmidt was able to reassemble twenty-five nearly complete folios, twenty-three from the body and two without pagination apparently from the end of the text (labeled A and B). In total the text contains 2100 Kucheian words, which makes it the longest continuous preserved Kucheian text (there are longer compilations like the Udānālankāra or Udānastotra; p. 4 and n. 10).

This Sarvāstivādin Karmavācanā text contains an ordination ritual for a Kucheian-speaking novice monk. The applicant is instructed to make a series of declarations of commitment in Kucheian. In several cases the ritual is bilingual, but then the Sanskrit follows the Kucheian. There are also monolingual Sanskrit passages, but these only occur where the community, and not the candidate, repeats the injunctions. The text is clearly designed for Kucheian speakers who have limited knowledge of Sanskrit.

Versions of the Karmavācanā in Sanskrit from Xinjiang have been well known for a long time and these are critical for understanding the Kucheian. But Schmidt determined that the closest parallel, surprisingly, is the one in Tumshuqese. Some passages feature a nearly word-by-word correspondence. As he succinctly noted, "Diese Entdeckung einer westtocharischen Textparallele ist für die Erschließung des tumšuqsakischen Textes, ja des Tumšuqsakischen überhaupt, von eminenter Bedeutung" (p. 3). Schmidt has been able to contribute to the understanding of the script as well to the analysis of the nominal and verbal morphology. In return, the deciphered Tumshuqese text casts some light on the Kucheian (p. 3).

One of the interesting and unique things about the Kucheian text is that there are often explanations, which have no parallels elsewhere, inserted between the individual Karmavācanās (p. 3).

The text contains thirty-five or so Kucheian words that had not been previously attested. In addition, the text enables Schmidt to propose corrections or refinements to a number of previously known words. With regard to syntax, the oblique relative pronoun *ce* is attested in use as a particle to introduce direct speech. The text contributes more than fifty new forms of Kucheian verbs (pp. 3–6). There are newly identified loans from Prakrit and from "iranischer Provenienz" (presumably Bactrian) (p. 7).

Chapter II has a description of the manuscript and a rigorous transliteration (with almost five hundred footnotes) with word boundaries indicated. Chapter III lists other Tocharian Karmavācanā texts and includes transliterations of three unpublished fragments. H 149.299 is for a layman, like the Tumshuqese, rather than for a novice monk, like the main Kucheian text.

Chapter IV is another version of the Tocharian text divided into topical passages. Besides this division, and some further emendations, there appears to be not much difference between the transliteration in Chapter II and this transliteration in Chapter IV. One might have expected a normalized transcription with Fremdzeichen like *ka* and *ma* resolved to *kä* and *mä*, and virāma replaced with a final consonant as has been usual for some time in this field, and is used elsewhere in the book by Schmidt. For example, corresponding to 10 a 1 *śa(kṣa)pat*, a normalized transcription would be *śā(kṣa)pat* (cf. Skt. *śikṣāpada* ‘moral commandment’). The Tocharian index is in the normalized system. In this case the lemma is *śikṣapāt* (with no indication of the *śā*- alternate).

Chapter V is the German translation following the same topical passages as Chapter IV. It fills twenty-two pages, reflecting the substantial nature of the text. Readers more comfortable with English may prefer the translation by T. Tamai (2014).

Chapter VI is an interesting and useful commentary on the text and translation (“Philologisch-sprachwissenschaftlicher Kommentar”). Significant parts have parallels in the Buddhist Sanskrit texts from Turfan. Schmidt notes that the Sanskrit was essential in the reconstruction of folios 9–11, helping reassemble the fragments and suggesting restorations. There is a useful, more or less word-by-word, comparison of five versions corresponding to folios 9 and 10 of the main Kucheian text, including two further Kucheian fragments, the Tumshuqese, and the Sanskrit parallels (pp. 88–92). Then follow sixteen pages (92–108) of commentary on the Kucheian, where Schmidt makes use of parallel Buddhist phrases from Sanskrit, Tocharian A, and other Kucheian texts.

Chapter VII is devoted to Schmidt’s discoveries about Tumshuqese: “Der Beitrag des Tocharischen zur Entzifferung des Tumšuqsakischen.” Unfortunately Zimmer does not give us the complete chapter. He notes that this section of the Habilitationsschrift was mostly presented in Hamburg in 1986 and then published as Schmidt 1988 (n. 1041 with incorrect date). He only includes parts that were either shortened or absent in 1988. So it is necessary to also consult Schmidt 1988 to get a more complete picture of Schmidt’s intent, which is somewhat awkward. I am guessing there still might be some value in consulting the original.

There is no doubt that the discovery of the Kucheian parallel marks an important milestone in the decipherment of Tumshuqese. But some of Schmidt’s discoveries need shared attribution.

Unknown to Schmidt in 1986, P. O. Skjærvø, an editor of many Khotanese Buddhist texts, was at the same time examining Emmerick’s 1985 and still standard edition of the Tumshuqese Karmavācanā. Skjærvø was similarly unaware of Schmidt’s discoveries and was also able to improve on Emmerick’s work, partly with a better comparison of the Sanskrit (Skjærvø 1987). Some critically important discoveries were made by both scholars. Both determined, for instance, that Tumshuqese *taro ātā* reflected the epithet of the Buddha, Sanskrit *tathāgata*- ‘the thus come’. The corresponding Tocharian *taiknesāk kekamu* has the same translation. Both scholars also determined that the form transliterated until then as *pyephuto* (Konow, Bailey, Emmerick) would be better given as *pyezu to* “höre du” (Schmidt, p. 109) and *pyežu to* “hear thou” (Skjærvø 1987: 84–85). Both noted the Sanskrit parallel *śṛṇu tvam* “listen, you” (Tocharian *pāklaus twe* ‘id.’) and the Khotanese cognate *pyūṣ*- ‘listen’. These details give us the firmest phonological information to date on this Tumshuqese Fremdzeichen—likely a retroflex voiced sibilant. (The symbol has had various roman transliterations. I transliterate mechanically and unambiguously as *rra* since it is a modified *rra* akṣara.)

The numerous other shared discoveries will not be mentioned here, nor will those only made by Skjærvø. But it is useful to point out some differing proposals where the Kucheian is decisive. Skjærvø gives *hvatā* ‘of the lord’ as the correspondent for *bhagavato* and compares Khotanese *hīyaund(a)*- ‘owner’ (Skjærvø 1987: 81). But with the Tocharian parallel *ñem-klawissu* ‘der Erhabene’ for *bhagavat*- Schmidt is able to tell us that the correct Tumshuqese correspondent here is *nāma hvata*- (p. 113; *ñem=nāma*- ‘name’). This may be one of several possible loan translations from the Kucheian (Schmidt 1988: 313). For Skjærvø *vatsyu* is second singular imperative ‘regard’ corresponding to *dhāraya*. He points to Khotanese *vajsāṣ*- ‘see, look at’ or “less probably” < **duājaja*- ‘grasp’ (1987: 82). Kucheian *peṅsa* confirms for Schmidt the meaning ‘ergreife!, halte!’ indicated by the Sanskrit *dhāraya* and he is able to suggest a Tumshuqese stem *vats*- (probably voiced final [dʰ]) corresponding to Khotanese *vāj*- ‘hold’ (pp. 112, 115 [vol. under review]). Skjærvø continues Emmerick’s proposal

that the speaker is a laywoman while Schmidt suggests that a layman is involved. This gender difference has important implications for Tumshuqese noun morphology. Thirty-five years after Emmerick's edition, a new one, containing insights from both scholars and perhaps from other more recent work (D. Maue, H. Ogihara, N. Ching have been active), has still not appeared.

The chart on noun inflection (p. 110) needs correcting on two lines. Correct are "Instr.-Abl. -āna [-āna]" and "Lok. -ya [-¹a]." P. 111 typo *hvatā* > *hvatā*.

Chapter VIII, "Zu den ältesten iranischen Lehnwörtern im Tocharischen," had a year earlier been published as a contribution to W. Winter's *Festschrift* (n. 1053; Schmidt 1985) and so should be well known to the scholarly community. It is puzzling to me why Zimmer chose to reproduce this chapter, apparently entirely, which had already appeared in print, apparently entirely, while the preceding chapter which only partly appeared in print is reproduced only in part.

Chapter IX is the bibliography. Chapter X has several indexes: 1. Subject. 2a. Sanskrit, with Kuchean correspondence, but no translations. Although advertised as complete ("vollständig") I notice the absence of *bhagavat-* and *tathāgata-*. 2b. Tocharian, with Sanskrit correspondences but again no translations. One has to look under the stem to find a particular word, which can be a drawback for non-experts. To find *śmalñe* or *kekamoṣ* one must look under *kām-*. There is no Tumshuqese index.

This book is challenging to describe. Some parts are critically useful while others are of dubious value. Still, I suspect the volume will be a much-consulted reference in many scholarly libraries for some time.

REFERENCES

- Emmerick, R. E. 1985. *The Tumshuqese Karmavacana Text*. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag.
- Hitch, D. 2009. *The Special Status of Turfan. Sino-Platonic Papers* 186.
- Schmidt, K. T. 1985. Zu einigen der ältesten iranischen Lehnwörter im Tocharischen. In *Studia Linguistica Diachronica et Synchronica: Festschrift für Werner Winter zum 60. Geburtstag*, ed. U. Pieper and G. Stickel. Pp. 757–67. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
- . 1988. Ein Beitrag des Tocharischen zur Entzifferung des Tumšuqsakischen. *Altorientalische Forschungen* 15.2: 306–14.
- Skjærvø, P. O. 1987. On the Tumshuqese *Karmavācanā* Text. *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* 119.1: 77–90. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0035869X00166985>
- Tamai, T. 2014. The Tocharian *Karmavācanā*. *Annual Report of The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhism at Soka University* 17: 365–34. [http://iriab.soka.ac.jp/content/pdf/ariab/Vol.%20XVII%20\(2014\).pdf](http://iriab.soka.ac.jp/content/pdf/ariab/Vol.%20XVII%20(2014).pdf)

DOUG HITCH
WHITEHORSE, CANADA

Brahmā's Curse: Facets of Political and Social Violence in Premodern Kashmir. By WALTER SLAJE. *Studia Indologica Universitatis Halensis*, vol. 13. Halle an der Saale: UNIVERSITÄTSVERLAG HALLE-WITTENBERG, 2019. Pp. viii + 53. €48.

The present volume—in fact a mere pamphlet, published however in an elegant hardback—is comprised of two short chapters, each of twenty-two pages. The first is entitled "A Glimpse into the Happy Valley's Unhappy Past: Violence and Brahmin Warfare in Pre-Mughal Kashmir," the second "What Does it Mean to Smash an Idol? Iconoclasm in Medieval Kashmir as Reflected in Contemporaneous Sanskrit Sources." The former prints a lecture delivered at Harvard University in March of 2018, the latter one at the University of Tokyo in March of 2019. Both examine social and political life in Kashmir's pre-Muslim antiquity, with the explicit goal of putting "the picture of premodern realities of life in Kashmir a bit into perspective" (p. viii).