



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

Review of Schmidt, K.T. (2018) Nachgelassene Schriften. 1. Ein westtocharisches Ordinationsritual. 2. Eine dritte tocharische Sprache: lolanisch.

Peyrot, M.

Citation

Peyrot, M. (2021). Review of Schmidt, K.T. (2018) Nachgelassene Schriften. 1. Ein westtocharisches Ordinationsritual. 2. Eine dritte tocharische Sprache: lolanisch. *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung*, 116(3), 260–261. doi:10.1515/olzg-2021-0087

Version: Publisher's Version

License: [Licensed under Article 25fa Copyright Act/Law \(Amendment Taverne\)](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/3246917>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

Zentralasien

Zimmer, Stefan (Hg.): *Klaus T. Schmidt: Nachgelassene Schriften*. 1. Ein westtocharisches Ordinationsritual. 2. Eine dritte tocharische Sprache: Lolanisch. Bremen: Hempen 2018. XVI, 275 S. m. Abb. 8° = Monographien zur Indischen Archäologie, Kunst und Philologie 24. Lw. € 88,00. ISBN 978-3-944312-53-8.

Besprochen von **Michaël Peyrot**: Leiden / Niederlande,
E-Mail: M.Peyrot@hum.leidenuniv.nl

<https://doi.org/10.1515/olzg-2021-0087>

In the present volume, Stefan Zimmer publishes two works by Klaus T. Schmidt (1932–2017) from his “Nachlass”. The speed and accuracy with which the editor has done his job are remarkable and laudable. The volume is characterised by a big divide between the two works: the first part is the publication of a solid and well received but up to now unpublished text edition, while the second part consists of an unfinished, completely new decipherment that has since its publication been subject to harsh criticism.

The first work (p. xi–159), *Ein westtocharisches Ordinationsritual*, is Schmidt’s edition of the Tocharian B *Karmavācanā*, a manual for the ordination ritual of monks. Schmidt had prepared this edition as a Habilitationsschrift for the University of Saarbrücken, where it was submitted in 1986 and accepted in 1987.¹ Copies of the typescript of this Habilitation were widely circulating and it had become customary to cite it.² However, like Schmidt’s 1974 Göttingen PhD thesis *Die Gebrauchsweisen des Mediums im Tocharischen*, it was never properly published, and the typescript was not in a good state, with many later corrections, partly hand-written.

Schmidt’s edition of the *Karmavācanā* is a solid piece of philological work. It is an edition of one birch bark manuscript from the Berlin Turfan Collection containing a *Karmavācanā* text with several additional *Karmavācanā* fragments from other manuscripts. For Tocharian B, which is attested from about the 5th to 8th centuries of the Common Era in Kuča, Yānqí and Turfan in present-day Northwest

China, birch bark manuscripts are very rare.³ Schmidt’s decipherment of this manuscript, together with his restorations of the many lacunae and his translation and commentary of the Tocharian B text, is of indisputable quality. In addition, he could align large parts with the Sanskrit and Tumšūqese *Karmavācanā*, which allowed important progress in the decipherment of the badly attested Iranian language Tumšūqese.

Stefan Zimmer’s publication of Klaus T. Schmidt’s edition of this important text is most welcome. Not only is the edition finally presented in an orderly, user-friendly way — at last, this important text edition is fixed in a reliable publication, providing a fixed point of reference for scholarship. It is certainly still to be preferred to the edition by Tamai (2014),⁴ and can now be compared additionally with the texts edited by Chung (2004),⁵ and complemented with the research of Ogihara (2013).⁶ The difficult text has been prepared carefully by the editor, with few details to be commented on. Some points to be noted are the following:

- p. 26, l. 2: śaulasontā > śaulasontā
- p. 28 and elsewhere: The difference between ś and ṣ could be clearer.
- p. 29, l. 30: klaussisa > klyaussisa
- p. 29, l. 32: [y](akaskemar) > [y](askaskemar)
- p. 49 ff. Fremdzeichen are indicated with underline, but virāma is curiously left out (see editorial footnote 527). Fortunately, this does not cause problems for understanding.
- p. 51, l. 38: [w][asi] > [w](asi)
- p. 51, l. 35: [p](o)ñ > [p](o)ñ
- p. 67, l. 36: [ṣ]lp(e)ltsa > [ṣ]p(e)ltsa
- p. 88, l. 1: ṣpāñi(ś > ṣpā ñi(ś
- p. 88, l. 9: wā)ṛpos > wā)ṛpoṣ
- p. 91, l. 26: ñreṣse > ñreṣṣe
- p. 92, l. 2: upāskasya > upāsakasya
- p. 102, l. 10: pā-klyauṣso > pāklyauṣso

³ Schmidt considers the possibility that this birch bark manuscript is, exceptionally, from Tumšūq, west of Kuča region. Otherwise it would probably be from Qizil in Kuča region.

⁴ Tamai Tatsushi, “The Tocharian *Karmavācanā*,” *Annual Report of The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhism at Soka University* 17 (2014): 365–394.

⁵ Jin-il Chung, *Das Upasampadāvastu. Vorschriften für die buddhistische Mönchsordination im Vinaya der Sarvāstivāda-Tradition. Sanskrit-Version und chinesische Version*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht 2004.

⁶ Ogihara Hirotoši 荻原裕敏, “On the *Karmavācanā* in Tocharian.” In: Matteo De Chiara, Mauro Maggi and Giuliana Martini (eds.), *Buddhism among the Iranian peoples of Central Asia*. Vienna: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften 2013, 311–331.

¹ I owe this precision to Rüdiger Schmitt (Laboe). In his necrology, Zimmer gives 1987 as the year of habilitation (Stefan Zimmer, “Klaus T. Schmidt (28.4.1932 – 7.2.2017),” *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies* 18 (2017): 1–17, p. 2; in the publication under review it is given as 1986 (p. xi).

² The edition on CEToM (www.univie.ac.at/tocharian), under the current press marks THT 1102–1125, is based on Schmidt’s thesis. CEToM = *A comprehensive edition of Tocharian manuscripts*. www.univie.ac.at/tocharian.

p. 102, l. 15: [pa](klyauṣ) > [pä](klyauṣ)

p. 119, l. 6–7: The inserted editorial remark “[falls nicht mit A markiert, sämtlich westtoch.]” is to be deleted: the following press mark “A 2” refers to the Tocharian B fragment PK AS 6C from the Paris Collection.

p. 123, l. 17: yentu-käñe > yentukäñe

The second work, published in the same volume on pages 161–271, is very different in character. It is entitled *Eine dritte tocharische Sprache: Lolanisch* and aims at the decipherment of a number of fragments written in a deviating type of Kharoṣṭhī, sometimes called “Formal Kharoṣṭhī” (I will use this term for convenience, even though it is not fully adequate). This decipherment is presented by Zimmer as “nachgelassenes Fragment”, and, indeed, it was never finished by Klaus T. Schmidt, and was not circulating among scholars. Schmidt had interpreted the Formal Kharoṣṭhī fragments as written in a variety of Tocharian, different from both attested languages Tocharian A and Tocharian B. According to him, this language was originally from Lóulán, so that he termed it “Lolanisch”.

The Formal Kharoṣṭhī fragments were known in the literature, but no attempt at a decipherment was ever published. In a lecture at Heidelberg University entitled “The Quandaries of an undeciphered script: The Formal Kharoṣṭhī corpus from Kucha” (2 November 2018), Diego Loukota Sanclemente had made some observations that seemed to point to an Iranian language related to Khotanese and Tumšūqese. Similar results were reached during a workshop on 15–16 September 2019 at Leiden University, attended by, among others, Stefan Baums (Munich), Ching Chao-jung (Kyoto), Hannes Fellner (Vienna), Georges-Jean Pinault (Paris) and myself. Building on the results of this workshop, a provisional attempt at a reading of one Formal Kharoṣṭhī fragment has been published by Dragoni, Schoubben and Peyrot (2020)⁷, to which the reader is referred for more detail. It is thanks to Schmidt’s work that the Formal Kharoṣṭhī fragments were brought to the attention again, but his decipherment is not properly worked out and explained, so that it will not be of much relevance to future scholarship.

In conclusion, despite my expectation that the second part on “Lolanisch” will not turn out to be useful, the volume can be recommended without reserve because it contains Klaus T. Schmidt’s important Habilitation thesis on the Tocharian B *Karmavācanā*, carefully prepared for

publication by Stefan Zimmer, to whom we should be grateful for having finally made this work available to everyone interested.

⁷ Federico Dragoni, Niels Schoubben and Michaël Peyrot, “The Formal Kharoṣṭhī script from the Northern Tarim Basin in Northwest China may write an Iranian language,” *Acta Orientalia Hungarica* 73 (2020): 335–373.