

Editorial

This volume of SCIAMVS contains four articles offering source materials from four different cultural areas — Mesopotamia, late antiquity, India, and Iran.

We received John Steele's article in October last year, but we had to ask him to wait for about a year because there was no room in the last issue. We appreciate his patience and continued contribution, which provides new sources from Mesopotamia.

In the case of late antiquity, there might not be many new materials which are waiting for publication, but the article by Jean Christianidis and Ioanna Skoura offers one of such sources in Greek. We are convinced that even a small fragment, such as in their article, should give a stimulus for further studies. We welcome this kind of contribution.

Bill Mak's article is another kind of contribution. The Sanskrit text of the *Yavanajātaka* itself has been well known since the publication of the text and translation by David Pingree. Very few Indologists have questioned his work. But my discovery of a new manuscript in Kathmandu in 2011 changed the situation. Working on the last chapter of the manuscript, Bill Mak found that Pingree's reading concerning the date of the text was wrong. He also found some other errors in Pingree's edition. Thus he thought it necessary to prepare a new edition of Chapter 79. Of course Pingree's achievement cannot be overestimated, but it is a duty of his students to correct teacher's mistakes, when they occur. I am sure that if Pingree were alive, he would appreciate Mak's article.

I am very glad that we could include an article of a young Japanese scholar in this volume. Yoichi Isahaya offers a Persian text and English translation of the Chinese calendar in a Persian text of astronomy. This is the oldest text which contains the so-called 'Chinese-Uighur calendar'. Isahaya has shown that this appellation itself is misleading.

In the editorial work of the last two articles, we were heavily indebted to the referees. The more interesting the articles are to the referees, the more detailed are the suggestions for improvement and corrections of errors. The more detailed the comments of a referee, the easier the author can identify the referee. Since this is a very small world of scholarship, it is natural that the referee and the author know each other. Thus it is almost impossible to keep the principle of anonymity. But still I want to maintain this principle.

At the end of this volume we included Nathan Sidoli's review. The book under review is on mathematics of late antiquity and closely related with the second article

of this volume. We would like to have more review articles on the publications of source materials.

Kyoto
December 25, 2013
Michio Yano