

identity: architecture of the Bengal Sultanate” (pp. 153–66) claims that the Turkic rulers adapted local artistic and architectural forms to their ritual needs, creating the peculiar Bengal style. In “Images of Ardhanaṛīśvara from Bengal and Nepal – a chronological survey” (pp. 167–82), Gerd Mevissen provides a comparative iconographic analysis of this specific image that appeared in Bengal in the second half of the twelfth century during Sena rule.

The fifth and sixth sections contain two papers each and focus, respectively, on Tibet and the Himalayan region, and Central Asia. Helmut Neumann and Heidi Neumann’s “Thirteenth and fourteenth century wall paintings in west Tibetan caves: style and iconography” (pp. 183–95), Erika Forte’s “On a wall painting from Toplukdong Site No. 1 in Domoko: new evidence of Vaiśravaṇa in Khotan?” (pp. 215–24), and Ciro Lo Muzio’s “New evidence on Sogdian painting from Uch Kulakh (Bukhara Oasis–Uzbekistan)” (pp. 225–36) represent significant contributions to the study of mural paintings of the cultural borderlands of South Asia. In “The Magru Mahādeva temple at Chhatri (Distr. Mandi, Himachal Pradesh): architectural and iconographical observations” (pp. 197–214), Anne-Claire Juramie analyses the architectural elements and iconographic programme of the building in the title, and defines its style – made of decorative elements of the classical *nāgara* style, vernacular architecture, and peculiar iconographies – as a regional development.

The publication of the proceedings of the EASAA conference is a much anticipated event for scholars working on South Asia. Since 1970, when the association was founded, the research presented at the conference has been at the forefront of the scholarly debate on South Asian archaeology and art, and this volume aptly follows the well-established tradition. The second volume of these proceedings was published in 2016.

Daniela De Simone
The British Museum

KLAUS T. SCHMIDT with STEFAN ZIMMER (ed.):

Nachgelassene Schriften. 1. Ein westtocharisches Ordinationsritual.

2. Eine dritte tocharische Sprache: Lolanisch.

(Monographien zur indischen Archäologie, Kunst und Philologie 24.) x, 275 pp. Bremen: Hempfen Verlag, 2018. ISBN 978 3 944 31253 8.

doi:10.1017/S0041977X20000245

The volume under review contains two posthumous publications by the late Tocharologist and Indo-Europeanist Klaus T. Schmidt. The first part (pp. 1–159) contains the author’s hitherto unpublished habilitation thesis from 1986, an edition of a Karmavācanā text in Tocharian B (with some text portions in Sanskrit), consisting of the fragments THT 1102–THT 1125. The text in question, an ordination ritual for Buddhist monks, is of immense importance to the study of Tocharian B, since, despite the fragmentary nature of the manuscript, it constitutes one of the longest continuous texts attested in the language. Following the introduction, the author provides a physical description of each individual manuscript fragment. The text itself is given in the form of a text rendition, in which the transcription is formatted according to the lines on the manuscript fragments, as well as a text edition, in which the transcription is presented continuously and furnished with additional text restorations. The transcriptions of the text are followed by a translation and a philological and

linguistic commentary. The author further provides an overview and transcriptions of other Karmavācanā fragments in Tocharian B that are not part of the edited manuscript. The final two chapters deal with the relationship between Tocharian and the Iranian languages. The author shows how the Tocharian B text in question can improve our understanding of the attested parallel text in Tumshuq Saka and of the Tumshuq Saka language in general. The final chapter is a general discussion of the oldest Iranian loanwords in Tocharian. The back matter contains both a subject index and a word index.

All the components of the author's original habilitation thesis are present in this edition, with the exception of part of his chapter on Tumshuq Saka, which he had already published elsewhere. The overall quality of Schmidt's original text edition can only be considered exemplary. Due to the fragmentary state of the manuscript, the text can only be understood in comparison with the various parallel versions in other languages, including Sanskrit, Tumshuq Saka, and Chinese. The author proficiently employs these parallel versions in order to fill in many of the numerous gaps in the Tocharian B manuscript and to restore and translate large portions of the original text. Due to the importance of this text and the high quality of the edition, a published version of Schmidt's habilitation thesis has long been a desideratum. It is therefore especially unfortunate that the editing of this particular version of Schmidt's work is rather poor. It contains a staggering number of typographic errors, including (but not limited to) missing or wrong diacritics that change or obscure the meaning of word forms (e.g. *śaulasonṭā* for *śāulasonṭā* "reverend one", pp. 26, 53) and missing opening or closing parentheses obscuring which portions of the transcribed text correspond to attested text and which ones are restored. Some hyphens that seem originally to have been meant to break a word across lines appear in the middle of a line, including cases within Tocharian forms, where the hyphen can be mistaken for a compound boundary (e.g. *yentu-kāñe* for *yentukāñe* "Indian", p. 123). In one case an example sentence has been attributed to the wrong manuscript fragment (THT 293 for THT 295, p. 120). What makes matters worse is that only a subset of the typographic errors and discrepancies between the two different text transcriptions that were present in the original version are remarked upon by the editor (in footnotes). As a result, a reader who only has access to the published version of the text has no way of knowing which errors/discrepancies can be attributed to the author and which were introduced during the editing process. Regrettably, all of these issues taken together make for a version of Schmidt's work that is only of limited use, as scholars will have to continue to consult a copy of the author's original manuscript for a faithful representation of his readings.

The second publication within the present volume (pp. 161–275) deals with a small corpus of manuscript fragments and wall inscriptions written in a special form of the Kharosthi alphabet and whose content or language has so far not been determined. The author attributes it to a hitherto unknown third Tocharian language, which he terms "Lolanisch" (henceforth *Loulanic*) after the geographic area of its use (Loulan/Kroraina). A short introduction is followed by an edition of the text corpus, including photographs, transcriptions, translations, and philological/linguistic commentaries. The entire corpus consists of roughly 260 word tokens (including word fragments and individual compound members). Only three of the ten discussed documents contain text portions of more than ten words uninterrupted by lacunae: a set of instructions for performing magic (69 Loulanic word tokens), and two wall inscriptions (25 and 29 word tokens). The text edition is followed by a fragment of a Loulanic grammar, a Loulanic–German dictionary, and a word index. Should the author's thesis prove to be correct, it would confirm the hypothesis of T. Burrow ("Tokharian elements in the Kharoṣṭhī documents from Chinese

Turkestan”, *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* 67, 1935, pp. 667–75) that a form of Tocharian was spoken in the geographic region of Loulan based on loanwords in Niya Prakrit, although Burrow’s work does not come up in the text. A detailed evaluation of Schmidt’s proposal will occupy the scholarly community for quite some time and is well beyond the scope of the present format. What can be said here is that despite the author’s ingenious ability to provide full translations of the better preserved documents, many of his interpretations and grammatical analyses are highly speculative and based on precious little data, even if we take his readings of the Kharosthi characters at face value. In addition, participants of the workshop *Schmidt’s Lolanisch Hypothesis* (14–16 September 2019, University of Leiden) deemed Schmidt’s overall readings of the Kharosthi characters “highly unlikely” (Hannes A. Fellner, p.c.). It therefore appears doubtful at the time of writing that Schmidt’s proposal of a third Tocharian language will hold up to scrutiny.

Bernhard Koller

Austrian Academy of Sciences – University of Vienna

CENTRAL ASIA

MARTIN GAENZLE (ed.):

Ritual Speech in the Himalayas. Oral Texts and Their Contexts.

(Harvard Oriental Series 93.) 222 pp. Cambridge, MA: Harvard

University Press, 2019. £36.95. ISBN 978 0 674 23790 2.

doi:10.1017/S0041977X20000257

Ritual Speech in the Himalayas aims to “present ritual texts in a way that allows them to be appreciated in their inherent richness” and to “show the various methodological possibilities of presenting oral ritual texts in written form” (pp. 3–4). Indeed, the greatest contribution of the volume lies in displaying various methods of rendering ritual speech in a format that can be read, understood, and valued by a diverse and multidisciplinary readership. Whereas Gaenzle himself uses interlinear translation, Shneiderman et al. employ sectional translation, de Sales and Huber use columnar translation, Morey and Schöpf combine morphological glossing, musical notation, and dance choreography, and Wettstein, von Stockhausen, and Rai use an innovative and highly visualized form of musical notation. These methods and their respective advantages and disadvantages for readers of specific backgrounds are summarized in Gaenzle’s introduction (pp. 8–10), but in the end, it is up to the individual reader’s background, purpose and interest which method is most revealing.

However, regardless of the chosen method and exact target audience, for the majority of this volume’s intended international readership, a transcription of an oral text in Roman script, be it a (semi-)official orthography or phonetic spelling, is a prerequisite. Hence, despite Shneiderman et al.’s justification (p. 107) for providing the Thangmi transcription solely in Devanāgarī script, this decision is unfortunate. While the authors’ choice succeeds as virtue signalling, it may not in practice widen access to the texts. The usefulness of the English translation in this contribution is further hampered by a lack of explanation of specific terminology printed in cursive, and in an edited volume about ritual speech, readers may actually wish to see the “specialized lexical terms” used in the “elevated ritual register of Thangmi” (p. 107) marked in some way or the other.