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Reviewed by Doug Hitch

This is a well conceived and well executed reference work containing a wealth of information and many new and good ideas. The tools (instrumenta) for Tocharian studies presented here are ten articles, divided into four groups: Expeditions (1 article), Collections and Concordances (5), Paleography (2), and Text Editions (2). We find articles by the long established Tocharologists Georges-Jean Pinault and Klaus T. Schmidt, by scholars of the next generation Michaël Peyrot and Malzahn herself, by Malzahn's student Hannes A. Fellner, and by a team consisting of Malzahn and five of her students. While Pinault’s article is in French and Schmidt’s is in German, all of the others are in English which makes this volume one of few reference works in English on Tocharian studies.

Hannes A. Fellner, “The Expeditions to Tocharistan”, (p. 13–36) is a history of the discovery of the rich linguistic treasures from the Tarim Basin, focussing on the Tocharian documents. There is a description of the Silk Road, of the early discoveries of the 1880’s and 90’s, and then of the British, Japanese, German and French expeditions of the late 19th and early 20th centuries. This is a well researched account brimming with enthusiasm. It includes a useful chart of the sites probed by each of 15 expeditions. A minor flaw is the repetition in footnote 31 of a popular folk etymology for Taklamakan, a name without a clear etymology.

Editing errors: p. 16 lionshare > lion’s share; fn. 4 capital, world’s metropolis > capital, the world’s metropolis; fn. 6 only > not only; p. 20 treasures troves > treasure troves; p. 23 researches > researchers; fn. 30 This caves > These caves; himself to the keeper > himself to be the keeper; attracted the European researches > attracted European researchers; p. 24 a dozen of languages > a dozen languages; the Eastern
Turkestan > Eastern Turkestan; fn. 36 to project an own expedition > to prepare his own expedition; fn. 37 and formed to the Jodo Shinshu > and reformed to the Jodo Shinshu; p. 27 more than hundred > more than one hundred; not to many > not too many; fn. 50 Tangerloo > Ton-gerloo; fn. 55 accessible to public > accessible to the public.

Anna-Maria Adaktylos, Hannes A. Fellner, Bernhard Koller, Melanie Malzahn, Katharina Simma, and Raimund Staudinger, “A Concordance to the Unedited Tocharian Texts of the Berlin Turfan Collection” (p. 39–78) casts light on the history of the preservation of the Berlin collection and of the various now out-dated numbering systems used on the as yet unedited Tocharian texts. The complexities of the older schemes are well explained. It would also be interesting to know the basis of the THT (Tocharische Handschriften Turfansammlung) numbering system which is the current standard for Tocharian texts in the Berlin collection. The chapter includes an impressive 39 page display of data, with three columns per page. The concordances match up each of the older enumerations or labels with the four digit THT number. A reverse index of the same data might also be useful. The concordances are followed by a three page list of the THT numbers of the Tocharian A fragments so far identified in the collection. It would be consistent and possibly useful to include the full names of the sites 1.4 MQ and 1.5 MQR.

Editing errors: p. 43 number consist of > number consists of; p. 46 1. Dakianus > 1.1 Dakianus.

Melanie Malzahn, “Tocharian Texts and Where to Find Them”( p. 79–112) provides an overview of the locations of the known texts and describes what editions, if any, have been made of these. She also notes where digital images of Tocharian manuscripts can be found on the web (TITUS, titus.fkidg1.uni-frankfurt.de for the Berlin materials and IDP, idp.bl.uk for the London collection). These online resources are now critically useful if not essential. She also lists all published print images where manuscript images are not online. For the manuscripts in the Berlin collection we learn that from among the 4098 inventory numbers, “at least 300 fragments of a noteworthy size remain yet to be edited” (p.80). There are descriptions of editing work by Sieg, Siegling,
Schmidt, Thomas, Malzahn and Winter, with THT numbers. There is a list of Sanskrit manuscripts containing Tocharian, under SHT (Sanskrithandschriften aus den Turfanfunden) numbers. The history of the London collection, associated with the names Hoernle and Stein, is well described. Most of the 1500 fragments are online at the International Dunhuang Project site (IDP) at the British Library. Many transliterations by Peyrot or Tamai appear on the IDP site. Editing work is listed from Broomhead, Lévi, Couvreur, Sieg/Siegling, Thomas, Tamai, and Filliozat. There are several useful concordances. Malzahn includes a list of about 25 unedited fragments from the Stein and Hoernle collections whose content she has identified. The St. Petersburg collection is kept by the Institute of Oriental Studies of the Russian Academy of Arts and Sciences, and most manuscripts remain unpublished [more than 100 years after their collection]. Editing work is listed by Leumann, Lévi, Pinault, Vorobyov-Desyatovsky, Schmidt, and Couvreur. The Otani collection from Japan is also mostly unpublished. Editing has been done by Sieg, Siegling, Inokuchi, Pinault, Tamai and Couvreur. In China there has been useful work on a limited number of finds. There has been editing work by Ji/Winter/Pinault, and Schmidt. Malzahn includes another useful instrument here, a more than four page list of “Abbreviations, sigla, and symbols used with Tocharian manuscripts” (p. 95–100). Appendix 1 is a chart of the find places with names in English, French, German, Chinese (Pinyin), Chinese, Uyghur, and a final column showing whether A or B or both languages were found there. The two Chinese columns are puzzling. Both purportedly contain Pinyin. While the first has no tone markings, the second has tone on some names but not others. Entries in the first column like Subash and Turpan make no sense. Appendix 2 is a map of find places.

Editing errors: p. 82 Malzahn, in print > Malzahn, in press; the abbreviation BM appears first on p. 88 but is first defined as British Museum on p. 90; p. 90 fact that was once > fact that it was once; p. 91 subcollections > subcollections.

Michaël Peyrot, “A Concordance of Hoernle and IOL Toch Press Marks” (p. 113–127) begins with two pages of text outlining the history of the numbering systems, scholarly work on the fragments, including translit-
eration work by him and Tamai on all the IOL Toch (India Office Library Tocharian) fragments digitised on the IDP website. This is followed by eleven pages of concordance comparing the Hoernle numbers with the new IOL Toch numbers. The concordance also contains a column listing editions and one giving the page in Broomhead’s unpublished 1962 PhD dissertation. The only suggestion is that Broomhead should appear in the references.

Michaël Peyrot, “Index to the Translations by Werner Thomas” (p. 129–161) presents part of an ambitious and laudable project to build an online database wherein one could look up any Tocharian manuscript and find references to all the places where translations have been published. He presents just a part here. He chose the translations of Werner Thomas because here the many scattered translations are perhaps least served by indices and so a concordance is most useful. Peyrot lays out a series of well-envisioned principles following which the 25 page (136–161) concordance is displayed.

Georges-Jean Pinault, “Concordance des manuscrits tokhariens du fonds Pelliot” (163–219) clearly shows many decades of intimate research on the materials acquired by Paul Pelliot and deposited in the national library (then Bibliothèque Nationale, today Bibliothèque nationale de France, BnF) in 1910. This chapter is based on a complete inventory Pinault developed in 1981 as there was no list or provisional inventory at the BnF. The Pelliot Kuchean or Tocharian B collection, “fonds Pelliot Koutchéen” (PK) contains almost 2000 pieces of which about half can realistically be used. They are all in B except for six fragments of a manual on medicine and magic in A. In addition, the Musée Guimet possesses objects with B inscriptions, photographs of wall inscriptions and one small fragment in A. The PK fonds has been numbered at least three times in a complex history, including work by Lévi, Filliozat and Couvreur, which is well detailed and documented by Pinault. He has not introduced a new system, instead keeping the third one developed by Filliozat and Couvreur (detailed below). Pinault has prepared a 160 page concordance of the three systems which was not possible to include here. This is the kind of thing which might be useful, online, in search-
able format. Pelliot himself kept a catalog of finds while in the field in a small black book. From this, Pinault extracted the mention of Brāhmī manuscripts on the survey route from Kucha to Dunhuang and together with original labels and other complex information has reestablished many of the find sites (171). It seems clear that the majority of the manuscripts come from the Kucha region, particularly from the ruined monastery at Duldur Aqur (Douldour-âqour).

There are five parts to the current enumeration system:

1 PK AS (Pelliot Koutchéen Ancienne Série). He gives a complete, well annotated inventory, listing find site, other numbers, content and publication.

2 PK NS (Pelliot Koutchéen Nouvelle Série). He lists only manuscripts published, cited or identified. Some of the identifications are new. The first item is worth noting. PK NS 1-6 is a Tocharian A manual on medicine and magic. As Pinault notes, “Cela suffirait à prouver que le tokharien A n’était pas une langue morte” (fn.19). Malzahn later in this volume also notes two monastery records in A from Shorchuk (THT 4022 and 4023; p.290 fn.48). Together these materials with other evidence cited by Malzahn make it certain that A was a living language at the time that the documents were written down. The old hypothesis of Winter that A was a liturgical language used by the Turks can be laid to rest.


5 PK Bois. (Pelliot Koutchéen Bois). Documents on wood. Within PK Bois, in 1987, he created groups A, B, C, essentially according to size, and retains this here. He also retains his use of a then new abbreviation, LP (laissez-passé) since most are caravan passes. Included here are six fragments of tablets written in the imperfectly understood Kuchean Kharoṣṭhī.

There follows a range of other useful lists, including: the manuscript or text abbreviations used by diverse authors; all the texts cited by Lévi and Meillet in articles from 1912 to 1916; the obsolete PK NS roman numer-
als used only by Couvreur. There is a section classifying texts: by title or topic; other buddhist literature; non-buddhist literature; profane texts; and texts in other languages (Bactrian, Gândhâri, Chinese, Sanskrit). As an appendix, he revises the reading of the extract of the Karmavibhaṅga originally published by Lévi, re-edited by Sieg without consulting the original manuscript, and given in Tocharisches Elementarbuch II, XXV. Pinault, examining the traces of characters on the original, makes a series of different readings and restorations, compares a Sanskrit version and produces a coherent result. He also offers a translation in German for comparison with Sieg’s, which until now has been the normative edition.

Editing error: P. 202 PK NX X > PK NS X.

Melanie Malzahn, “A Tocharian Brahmi Chart” (p. 224–254) is the first of two chapters under the heading “Paleography”. The chart contains akṣaras taken from typical manuscripts. There is a complete list of radical plus diacritic combinations. There is an extensive and useful list of ligatures of two radicals but it is not clear if this is meant to be exhaustive. Using different vocabulary from mine, she describes the use of the Fremdzeichen, the special new signs, to show an incorporated ā vowel, and to stand in virāma position (± final consonant). Finally there is the description of the non-Indic use of vowel symbols that, according to Malzahn, “seems to denote one syllable peak” (225) and follows the traditional transliteration practice. I think there are at least three distinct things subsumed here. 1) The use of radical <u, i, ī> in virāma appears to show a diphthong. If the transliteration practice of putting the virāma stroke before the radical, as in the original, is used, instead of after as is usually done, then cases like <sāu> or <kōi> can be rendered simply <sā`u> or <ko`i>. 2) The use of diacritic <u> below <ka> (usually rendered <ku>) and above another consonant radical as in <ḳ̡u>se may show that a rounded velar stop /kʷ/ existed at one time in B, as is assumed by some scholars. The existence of this segment is also suggested by the borrowing Kwirapabhadra- B296b8–9 < Sanskrit Vīrabhadra ‘name of a Gandharva’, and alternations like kwaṣ(ṣ)ai (obl.sg.) ~ ḳ̡saiñ (nom.pl.) ‘village’. 3) The stacking of stackable akṣaras can be for metrical, not phonological, reasons as in m̥añcu for m̥añcu or winā for winā.
There are 27 pages of useful akṣara charts (227–254). It is not an easy task to collect, organize and present this mass of technical detail. Still, this admirable work can be improved. The presentation of subscript vocalic diacritics, “The ones [vowels] written below Ca signs” (227) has two issues. While there are three distinct shapes for subscript diacritic <-u> in the script (compare <ku, cu, tu>, p. 233), only two are presented here. And the last two signs in the list are neither “dependent vowel” nor “written below Ca signs”, but rather are vocalic radicals, written in vi-rāma. From p. 228 on, it would be helpful if the tops of the akṣaras in rows would line up, as they do in carefully written manuscripts. As is well known, the new sign <ṭa> is the usual <dha>, repurposed. The disparity in shape between these on the “Basic signs” chart (228) belies this. On the next page, the subscript versions of these two are even more different from each other. If not for the label, I would say that the <-dha> there is actually a <-ṭha>. There is no heading at the beginning of the section displaying radicals in ligature. While most of these are correctly defined as ligatures “composed of two CV signs” (221), this definition does not apply to the rows of type <rCa>. For these, the <r-> is a superscript diacritic and not the radical <ra>. The heading of the row would be preferable as <r->, rather than <ra>.

Editing errors: p. 225 obliviously > obviously; p. 221 manuscript exist > manuscript exists.

Melaine Malzahn, “The Most Archaic Manuscripts of Tocharian B and the Varieties of the Tocharian B Language” (p. 255–297) is a substantial and welcome contribution to the history of the Tocharian script and language. As someone long interested in Tarim Brāhmi paleography, I read this chapter with eagerness. Several years ago when I first saw these archaic manuscripts online it was instantly clear that they are critically important to understanding the origin and development of the peculiar non-Indic features of Tocharian writing. The archaic character shapes immediately caused me to reconsider some ideas about the origin and development of the script.

Malzahn begins by showing how a study of paleography (now immensely facilitated by the online images at TITUS and IDP) supports Stumpf’s view that the attested B dialects are chronological and opposes
Winter’s view that they are geographic. [Peyrot 2008 continues this chronological elaboration.] She has surveyed all 5500 fragments that are accessible from Berlin and London. She identified 60 fragments in Early Turkestan Brāhmī (ETB), the precursor to the North Turkestan Brāhmī (NTB) in which the majority of Tocharian documents are written. Sander, who devised the Tarim Brāhmī evolution, Indian Gupta > Turkestan Gupta > ETB > NTB in 1968, noted that ETB is not a standardized script but shows a range of forms. Malzahn has examined the script in the Tocharian ETB manuscripts and has devised four chronological categories: most archaic, middle archaic, early common archaic, and late common archaic. As her discussions show, the boundaries among these are not always clear, and there may be intermediate forms, but it is still a useful idea. To do this categorization she has selected several indicator signs, “shibboleths”, which best show differences among stages. In the discussion of the evolution of the Fremdzeichen, she makes useful and interesting suggestions but misses two critical points. The Brāhmī scripts used for Tumshuqese, Uyghur (Old Turkic) and Sogdian also feature some of these new signs. It is unlikely that these are borrowed from Tocharian as there are also new signs which the others share and which Tocharian does not. For instance, the Tumshuqese, Uyghur and Sogdian Brāhmī scripts all share <za>, <ga> and <Ďa> while Tocharian Brāhmī does not use them. At the same time, the most geometrically shaped Fremdzeichen in Tocharian, the four-window-pane shaped <ņa>, is the only one not attested in use for another language. This complex distribution needs to be explained. Hitch 1983 and Maue 1997, both overlooked by Malzahn, offer some suggestions to explain the distribution. The second point which must be considered in this is the peculiar specialization of the Tocharian Fremdzeichen for use in virāma. The script adaptors could have easily used plain <pa, ta, ka>, etc., in virāma instead of new <roups pa, ta, ka>, etc. Later in the same chapter Malzahn offers a historical phonological explanation (282–284) but as argued below, an orthographic explanation makes more sense. Also, this theory does not explain the original use of the Fremdzeichen to write ä. There is clearly more to be said about the origin of Tocharian writing.

Because the new sign <wa> is derived from radical <o> (as far as I can tell, first noted by me in 1981; Hitch 1983: 309–311), rather than radi-
cal <u>, Malzahn concludes, “that the speakers of Tocharian had in use a non-syllabic o-sound” (260). The first objection to this idea is that it is not proven that it was Tocharian speakers who developed this graph. The sign <wa> was also used with the other languages mentioned above and may have originated in an unattested tradition. The second objection is that it is not possible to phonetically distinguish two types of [w] glides, one closer to [u] and one to [o]. It makes better sense to see the explanation in the graphic shapes. Radical <o> was plausibly seen by the adaptor to work better in ligatures than radical <u>. Her other evidence, that o is written <w> in metrical or sandhi contexts, does not support the idea of a “non-syllabic o-sound”. In theory, one might expect initial u- to sometimes be rendered <w-> as well, but there are very few native B words that begin with u-. In the glossary to Tocharisches Elementarbuch II, of the 14 u- words, 13 are from Sanskrit and one, uwe “geschickt”, appears to be native and would likely not be written *<wwe> in meter or sandhi.

Malzahn’s proposal that the Fremdzeichen <pa> is originally from Indic <ba> was first suggested by Filliozat (1948: 26, fn.5; as pointed out to me by M. Peyrot). I have also long thought this possible, but the idea has the difficulty that graphically distinct <pa> and <ba> are both in use in Tocharian manuscripts in different functions. I have also had the opinion that the new sign <ka> plausibly comes from the use of regular <kha> in virāma. But now something else should also be considered in this discussion. The shapes of these three new signs in the most archaic forms are basic geometric ones: <ta> a triangle, <pa> a square, and <ka> a figure “8” or hourglass. The new sibilant signs <sa> and <sa> in their archaic forms are also elegantly symmetrical shapes and mirror images of each other. We now need to consider the idea that the signs were created new, from geometric shapes, rather than modified from existing signs.

Malzahn notes that one or more interior strokes were added to <ta> to form both <sa> and <na> and similarly <pa> is the base shape of <ma>. The correctness of this observation is shown by the fact that the graphic coherence persists as these shapes evolve over time. This coherence can be used to help identify signs. If one is not sure if a sign is <na> or <ma>, if the outside shape matches that of <ta>, the sign is
<ṇa>, and if it matches <pṇa>, it is <ṃa>. I am not sure about Malzahn’s idea of the rotation of <ṭa> to make <pṇa> and <dha> to make <ṭa>. While <ba> and <pṇa> are always distinct within a manuscript if they both occur, <dha> and <ṭa> are identical in all cases I have seen. The idea of using basic geometric shapes might be simpler.

The shibboleths which persist the longest in their archaic forms are the new sibilant signs <śa> and <ṣa>. Malzahn suggests for the first time in print that I know, that these are derived from the numeral sign for 50 through rotation by 90º and 270º respectively (262). She notes that there is no clear motivation for this. It may also be worthwhile adding to this discussion two signs which are graphically similar to the archaic shapes of <śa> and <ṣa>, Manichean script <t> and Tumshuqese, Sogdian and Old Turkic <ḍa> (Hitch 1983: 298–300).

In discussion of the origin of <ṛa>, she mentions that /rā/ is rendered by the regular vocalic radical <ṛ> in THT 1520, one of the most archaic documents. Possibly the original practice was to use the Indic radical and subscript forms of <ṛ> for Tocharian /rā/, mimicking Sanskrit practice, and then a new radical <ṛa> was created from the subscript on the analogy of the shapes of radical (headed) and subscript (headless) <ta, na, ra>, etc. Her suggestion that ḻa is a “horizontally flipped Indian <ṭa>” (263) has no motivation other than graphic similarity. She does not mention the long standing idea in Tocharology that the sign is simply Sanskrit <ṛ> (Krause and Thomas 1960: 40) nor the similarity with Manichean script <ḷ> (Hitch 1983: 298–300). Her suggestion that <ḵa> “may have been based on the original shape of the foreign sign <ṛa>, whose gaps were closed” (263) is baffling. The shapes are not all that similar, and the functions are different.

Malzahn is able to improve upon the Sieg/Siegling loose classification “old ductus”. She gives a list of documents having archaic ductus and includes all those described by Sieg/Siegling as having “old ductus” whether it is actually archaic or not.

She presents a case for saying that the BM document is actually older than THT 3602, reversing K.T. Schmidt’s opinion on these two content-related texts. She gives a new transliteration of THT 3602. She lists the most archaic manuscripts and gives a new transliteration of THT 1520. This could be the oldest sample of Tocharian writing since it still uses
the indic vocalic radical <ṛ> instead of the Fremdzeichen radical <ṛa> (twice in a 4). Malzahn shows that the adaptation of Brāhmī to Tocharian took place “when Gupta characteristics were still in use” (277). This pushes the adaptation back to the beginning of the fifth or even the end of the fourth century CE.

Except for one from Shorchuk and one from Endere, all archaic script texts come from Kucha, and all are in the so-called MQ dialect. This seems to prove that the dialect is chronological, rather than geographic, supporting Stumpf over Winter. Further, the paleography enables Malzahn to further define the evolution of the distribution of ā ~ a ~ ā. Another interesting fact uncovered by Malzahn is that there is no virāma in the most archaic manuscripts other than an unclear <saṁ‘n> in THT 2677a b2. We find <padmaḵa> ‘lotus’ and <curṇa> ‘powder’ which later are written <padma‘k> (padmaḵ帨) and <cu‘rṇ> (curṇ帨). She then theorizes that what I call the virāma-specialization of the Fremdzeichen in the standard script is “to be explained as a reminiscence of the constant use of foreign signs to render word-final (*)-Cā in that most archaic period of Tocharian writing” (283). It may be more plausible that the language has not evolved on this point, just the script. That is, the Fremdzeichen in the earliest attestations were being used ambiguously for /kā/ and /-k/, and then later the finals were put into virāma.

In the next youngest layer of the manuscript tradition, final vowels are added in metrical texts. While Malzahn sees this practice as showing survival of historical forms, it may also be the case that these additions are orthographically, not linguistically, determined. That is, the signs normally showing vowellessness in virāma are written instead on the line where meter requires an extra syllable. With Fremdzedichen such as <pa>, <ṭa>, <kṣa>, etc. this has the effect of adding [ā]. But with <ca>, which has no corresponding Fremdzeichen, this adds [a]. This would also explain the phenomenon in the next youngest layer discussed by Malzahn, that we find <ca>, and not <cā>, instead of <’c> where meter requires an extra syllable. An orthographic explanation makes more sense than a historical phonological one.

She collects and examines much evidence concerning the distribution of metrical spellings over time. These include the preservation of
final -ä, substitution of -o for final -ā, use of ā, ĩ, ī in place of a, i, u, and of -ca in place of -c or -cā. She concludes that this is not simply a poetic phenomenon, but rather “a borrowing from the most formal (= lentissimo styles) of Tocharian B” (285). One of her best insights is evidence that later Tocharian B scribes were copying older texts. Because the shapes of <ṉa̱> and <ṃa> changed significantly between the archaic and standard ductuses, later scribes misinterpreted an archaic <ṃa> and miscopied it as <ṅa̱>. This confirms that we cannot assume that all manuscripts in standard ductus contain language of the age of that ductus. A document in standard writing may contain language from an older period.

Her paleographic efforts largely confirm the position of Stumpf that the dialect variation seen in B is temporal rather than geographic, but she still supports Winter’s idea that the eastern variety of B, from Turfan, was a geographic dialect. This is because the language there shows Tocharian A-isms in phonology, morphology and lexicon. This is further evidence that A was a living language.

“The shibboleth signs,” the akṣara chart at the end of the article is a most useful comparison of a select set of 14 signs in ten columns according to age ranging from the ETB to the Standard B script. A few improvements could be made. It would be helpful to indicate which columns contain which of the age categories defined by Malzahn: most archaic, middle archaic, early common archaic, common archaic and standard. I would reorder the rows so that the graphically related groups of signs, <ṇa ~ ṇa> and <ṭa ~ ṭa ~ ṇa> appear together to better show their relationship and that it remains constant over time. I would add the remaining Fremdzeichen, <ṅa, ṭa, ṭa> for completeness. <ṅa> in archaic writing is sometimes shaped more like an hourglass and sometimes more like a figure “8” and it might be useful to monitor its development over time. For <ṛa>, it is worth noting that in the earliest mss. it seems that Indic vocalic radical <ṛ> was used before the new radical <ṛa> was developed. I would order the THT 2668ff. column as the first after ETB since the signs for <śa> and <ṣa>, with open ends, appear to be the oldest or most primitive. Lastly, in the THT 2668ff. column, the image given in the <wa> row is actually of <ṅa>. Compare THT 2677d b3 kā ywā where the <ṅa> has two closed loops while <wa> in ligation.
beside it has none. In addition, <wa> in these documents has a peculiarly flat top. This feature might be more primitive and a clue to the origin of the sign. It may be another indication that the script in THT 2668ff. is the oldest.

Editing errors: p. 262 somehow matches > somewhat matches; p. 267 most archaic Tocharian mss. at all > of all; p. 271 see fn. 16 above > below.

**Text editions**

Melanie Malzahn, “A Preliminary Survey of the Tocharian Glosses in the Berlin Turfan Collection,” is a survey of Tocharian words found in the so-far published volumes (1–9) of the Berlin Turfan Sanskrit manuscripts (Sanskrithandschriften aus den Turfanfunden = SHT). Many identifications were made previously by K.T. Schmidt. Again, this is a useful list for specialists. Besides the analysis of published texts by sequential SHT number, she mentions one still unedited text with glosses, and gives a list of Brāhmī charts containing Fremdzeichen. At the end there are Tocharian A and B indexes.

Correction: p. 311, The is the > There is the.

Klaus T. Schmidt, “THT 1540”, is an edition of a short but very unique and important Tocharian B text. The script is old. Schmidt calls it ETB (Malzahn further defines it as middle archaic, 266). There are archaisms in morphology and lexicon. The subject matter is also of interest. The usual version of this Jātaka tale involves a male elephant taking care of his blind mother. The Tocharian B version involves a female elephant caring for her parents. THT 1540 consists of 13 fragments, labelled a–m. Using a variety of clues including metrical structure (5-4-3/5-4-3-3/5-4-3/5-4-3-3) he is able to line up the four largest fragments, a with b, and f with g, and determine recto and verso for all. He notes the stylistic use of epiphora: there are independent or suffixed pronouns before the first caesura of every pāda (that is, at the end of each 5-syllable foot).
Schmidt identifies B *ewk/-auk*-, A *ok*- ‘trinken lassen, zu trinken geben’ as conjunctive (and causative) stem to AB *yok*- ‘trinken’.

One criticism is that the facsimiles are of mediocre quality and difficult to use.

This both useful and stimulating volume will be on the desks of students of Tocharian for a very long time.

[Received: June 2011]
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