



Title	<Book Review>Olga Lundysheva, Anna Turanskaya, and Hiroshi Umemura (eds.), Catalogue of the Old Uyghur Manuscripts and Blockprints in the Serindia Collection of the Institute of Oriental Manuscripts, RAS. Volume 1. Tokyo: The Toyo Bunko, 2021, 386 pp., +30 pls.
Author(s)	Fu, Ma
Citation	内陸アジア言語の研究. 2022, 37, p. 143-152
Version Type	VoR
URL	https://hdl.handle.net/11094/91334
rights	
Note	

The University of Osaka Institutional Knowledge Archive : OUKA

<https://ir.library.osaka-u.ac.jp/>

The University of Osaka

Book Review

Olga Lundysheva, Anna Turanskaya, and Hiroshi Umemura (eds.), *Catalogue of the Old Uyghur Manuscripts and Blockprints in the Serindia Collection of the Institute of Oriental Manuscripts, RAS*. Volume 1. Tokyo: The Toyo Bunko, 2021, 386 pp., +30 pls.

FU Ma^{*}

The discovery of Old Uighur manuscripts at the end of the 19th century and the early 20th century marks a great progress in the field of Turkology and Central Asian studies. During the Russian expedition in Northwestern China in 1893–1895, V. I. Roborovsky managed to obtain the first group of Old Uighur texts so far known to the modern academia. Along with the Berlin Turfan collection, the Serindia (Central Asian; hence SI) collection of the Institute of Oriental Manuscripts (hence IOM) presents the most voluminous and diverse collections of Old Uighur texts in the world. However, unlike the Berlin collection, which has been systematically edited, catalogued and published online, the Old Uighur manuscripts and block prints in the SI collection have remained in a very large part inaccessible to the wide academic circle. Aiming at producing a complete catalogue for the public, scholars from IOM, RAS and the Toyo Bunko in Tokyo has launched a joint project, the first outcome of which is the present volume compiled by Olga Lundysheva, Anna Turanskaya and Hiroshi Umemura and edited by Peter Zieme, marking the initial phase to full accessibility to the largest portion of the SI collection.

As is well known, the Old Uighur manuscripts and blockprints of the SI collection were collected reportedly from a large variety of sites in northwestern China by different hands. In the prologue “Serindia collection of the IOM, RAS” (XXII–XXXVI), the editors give clear introductions of the provenance, acquisition and processing of Old Uighur fragments in each subcollection. As the editors stressed, the **Berezovsky subcollection** is of special value for its accurate indication of the sites where the fragments were found (XXVIII). Among them, some thirty Old Uighur fragments were collected in On-bash Ming-oi in the region of Kucha. Two of them (**nos. 576 and 577**) are catalogued in this volume. The majority of Old Uighur texts were collected in the region of Turfan and Dunhuang, with a small number of texts found in other sites. In Kucha, which used to be part of the West Uighur kingdom, very scarce written materials dating to the Old Uighur times have ever been collected. These fragments will serve as important source materials for scholars to research the activity of Old Uighurs in this region. The **Dyakov subcollection** is said to be acquired in the

* 付馬, 北京大學中國古代史研究中心助理教授 (FU Ma. Assistant Professor, Center for Research on Ancient Chinese History, Peking University)

site of Astana in Turfan. If any of these manuscripts were unearthed from the Astana site in north of the ruined city of Gaochang 高昌, they would be the first Old Uighur manuscripts found there. However, more information on **Dyakov subcollection** is needed. As is mentioned by the editors, the provenance of the more than 300 Old Uighur fragments in **the Dunhuang collection (IX.)** requires further research. As is shown in this volume as well as in previous studies, many of them can be joined to fragments in the SI collection and traced to Turfan. Hopefully the following volumes can also include fragments in **the Dunhuang collection**, creating a more comprehensive overview of the Old Uighur collections in IOM.

This volume gives 601 entries for 564 fragments in total, including all the texts that have been published since the very early time of Wilhelm Radloff and Sergei Malov up till now. Despite the claimed focus on published texts, it also includes some unpublished texts with the editors' latest identification for the first time, providing important data in addition to the published texts of similar contents (**nos. 4, 8, 11, 108–110, 351–352, 457–458, 588**, etc. see below). Still, it lists some so-far unidentified texts that are either edited or not, leaving hints for specialists to carry out further studies. For example, 19 fragments are catalogued under the title “Unidentified Buddhist texts” (**nos. 353–371**) in Chapter “**VI. Other Buddhist Texts.**”

Based on their themes and contents, the entries are organized in twelve chapters. In accompany with this method, the editors provide an index of work titles after the catalogue, including Sanskrit, Chinese, Old Uighur as well as special titles. In particular, many texts are linked to more than one titles. This facilitates specialists and readers with different academic backgrounds to search for their target texts to the utmost degree. For example, the famous Old Uighur version of *Suvarṇaprabhāsaśūtra* can be also searched out via its Old Uighur short title *Altun yaruk*.

Under each entry, the editors provide a full set of data on reference numbers (catalogue number, SI call number and former call number), origin (name of acquirer, provenance), physical description of fragment (type, script, script type, format, description, size, paper), description of text (elements, number of lines, content), reference to previous publications (edition, quotation, facsimile). As for the script type, one has to notice that the Uighur script is categorized into only two groups in this volume: “calligraphic” and “cursive,” which is different from the theory proposed by Takao Moriyasu who has categorized Old Uighur scripts into four groups. Moriyasu's theory, aimed at the dating of Old Uighur manuscripts, views the cursive scripts as an important criterion for lateness, i.e., dates to the Mongol times. However, “cursive” in the present volume seems to indicate merely the way and attitude the scribe took to write, but not the lateness of the manuscripts. For example, the script of **no. 496** is designated as “cursive” (p. 227, Plate 19), but is viewed as semi-square and dated to pre-Mongol times, according to Moriyasu's theory (BTT XLVI: #61).

More than a catalogue with only references to preceding publications, the editors also give corrections, complements and comments to the preceding editions in the “Notes” at the end of each entry, providing the up-to-date results of study on these texts. In **no. 298**, the editors correct a long-accepted misinterpretation of the word *arsīyan* < Skt. *rasāyan* “nectar” in line 5. In **no. 558**, the previously unsolved word *ṢY* is deciphered

as transcription of Chinese *shi* 詩. As a result, the nature of the text can be confirmed as a poem. For the unedited fragments **no. 381** and **no. 384**, the editors suggest not only their contents as Old Uighur translation of *Qian zi wen* 千字文, but also their joining with previously edited fragments as belonging to the same manuscript.

Carefully selected by the editors, 51 figures of manuscript and block prints are reproduced in the 30 plates in this volume. Most of them have been already identified or edited before, but their facsimiles, due to some reasons, have not been published until this volume. Moreover, it includes several unedited or unidentified texts. This meritorious supplement and completion to previous editions make it possible for scholars to evaluate the previous editions and to carry out further studies.

Chapter “**I. Non-Mahāyāna Texts**” contains 110 entries in three subgroups: “Āgamas” (**nos. 1–20**), “non-mahāyāna sūtras and avadānas” (**nos. 21–27**), and “*Daśakarmaphathāvadānamālā*” (hence DKPAM, **nos. 28–110**), which includes the majority of entries in this chapter. In the subgroup “Āgamas,” the editors newly identified three fragments (**nos. 4, 8, and 11**) as *Madhyamāgama*, *Samyuktāgama* and *Ekottarikāgama*, respectively. Also for DKPAM, the editors add three fragments (**nos. 108–110**) to the 80 entries which had been edited by Shogaito/Tugusheva/Fujishiro 1998 and BTT XXXVII. The “Edition” of **no. 61** should have “BTT XXXVII” instead of “BTT XXV” (p. 26).

Chapter “**II. Mahāyāna Texts**” includes six subgroups of texts:

- (1) *Buddhāvataṃsakasūtra* (**nos. 111–139**)
- (2) *Avalokiteśvara sūtras* (**nos. 140–152**)
- (3) *Vajracchedikāprajñāpāramitāsūtra* (**no. 153**)
- (4) *Nidānasūtra* (**no. 154**)
- (5) *Daśabalasūtra* (**nos. 155–156**)
- (6) *Suvarṇaprabhāsottamasūtra* / *Altun yaruk* (**nos. 157–159**)

The common feature of these texts is that they are either literal translation of or largely based on a certain Chinese version of the corresponding *sūtra*. Therefore, the exact Chinese titles and versions for the texts are even more important than the Sanskrit ones, which illustrate the direct sources for the Old Uighur texts. The editors do note the Chinese *Vorlages* and parallels in “Contents” in some cases, but not regularly. For Chinese translation of *Buddhāvataṃsakasūtra*, three versions are preserved in the Chinese canons with the same title *Da-fang-guang-fo hua-yan jing* 大方廣佛華嚴經, which are commonly referred to as *Liu-shi hua-yan* 六十華嚴 “the Sixty *hua-yan*” (T. 278), *Ba-shi hua-yan* 八十華嚴 “the Eighty *hua-yan*” (T. 279), and *Si-shi hua-yan* 四十華嚴 “the Forty *hua-yan*” (T. 293) according to respective numbers of their volumes. The entries in the subgroup “*Buddhāvataṃsakasūtra*” have all been identified as Old Uighur translation of the Chinese

version “the Forty *hua-yan*” (T. 293), but many of them are simply designated as “ASS” without a reference to its exact Chinese *Vorlage*. **No. 153**, the only fragment in the subgroup “*Vajracchedikāprajñāpāramitāsūtra*” has already been identified as an Old Uighur translation generally based on the Chinese version translated by Kumārajīva (T. 235), which should be noted in this entry. Similarly, the very likely *Vorlage* for the two fragments in “*Daśabalaśūtra*” (**nos. 155–156**), *Fo-shuo shi-li-jing* 佛說十力經 (T. 780) should be added to these entries, too.

Nos. 157–159 represent parts of the famous large Pustaka book of the Old Uighur version of *Suvarṇaprabhāsottamasūtra* obtained by Malov at Suzhou, Gansu (SI 4498, 4499, 4500, former SI M/1–M/3). These three entries could have been integrated so that readers easily understand them as belonging to one manuscript. Here are noted minor memorandums: **no. 157** describes its provenance as “Wenzhu kou (文珠口),” in contrast to “Wenshukou” in **nos. 158** and **159**. During Malov’s time the site was usually called Wenshu-kou 文殊口, although in modern China it is referred to as Wenshu-gou 文殊溝. The year of completion in **no. 157**, wrongly noted “1687,” should be corrected to “1688” as in **no. 158**. It would have been better to note that the Old Uighur text is a free translation of the Chinese version *Jin-guang-ming zui-sheng-wang jing* 金光明最勝王經 (T. 655) translated by Yijing 義淨, as should be noted in all the three entries in this subgroup. The facsimile of one folio of **no. 157** is published in this volume for the first time (Plate 27), which is designated as “4th juan, f. 1” in “Facsimile” (p. 68). However, it should be the “5th juan, f. 1,” as one can confirm via the facsimile (Plate 27, Fig. 1): we find the pagination *bešinč bir ki-y-ä* “the 5th (volume), (folio) 1” in smaller Uighur script on the left side, as well as the end of the title in red ink, *gyetinč bölük 9bešinč tüzgzinč* “the 7th chapter, the 5th volume” in the main text.

Chapter “**III. Abhidharma Texts**” includes six fragments of the Old Uighur translation of Chinese *Ru a-pi-da-mo lun* 入阿毘達磨論 (**nos. 160–165**), which, as the editors put in “Notes,” belong to one manuscript. The Taishō number for the Chinese text in each entry, “T. 1154,” should be corrected to “T. 1554.” **No. 166**, identified as an Old Uighur translation of the Chinese text *Da-cheng fa-yuan-yi-lin zhang* 大乘法苑義林章 and obviously not belonging to the *Abhidharma* texts, has been mistakenly put in this chapter. It should be categorized in Chapter “**VI. Other Buddhist Texts**” together with other fragments of the same text (see below). This entry probably represents an unedited fragment newly identified by the editors. The references in “Edition” are misleading, since they are actually the editions of its parallel text in another manuscript. In “notes,” the editors suggest three more fragments that belong to the same manuscript (p. 74).

Chapter “**IV. Chinese Apocrypha**” includes texts translated from Chinese texts in thirteen subgroups:

- (1) 白蓮社經 *Bai-lian-she jing* (**nos. 167–168**)
- (2) 圓覺經 *Yuan-jue jing* (**no. 169**)
- (3) 善惡因果經 *Shan-e yin-guo jing* (**no. 170**)

- (4) 慈悲道場懺法 *Ci-bei dao-chang chan-fa* (nos. 171–182)
- (5) 金剛經纂 *Jin-gang-jing zuan* (nos. 183–187)
- (6) Commentary to *Vajracchedikāsūtra* (nos. 188–190)
- (7) 佛頂心陀羅尼 *Fo-ding-xin tuo-luo-ni* (nos. 191–193)
- (8) *Garbhāparimocanasūtra* (nos. 194–198)
- (9) 佛說北斗七星延命經 *Fo-shuo bei-dou-qi-xing yan-ming jing* (nos. 199–207)
- (10) 佛說天地八陽神咒經 *Fo-shuo tian-di ba-yang shen-zhou jing* (nos. 202–268)
- (11) 大乘法苑義林章 *Da-sheng fa-yuan-yi-lin zhang* (nos. 269–271)
- (12) 十王經 *Shi-wang jing* (nos. 272–274)
- (13) 悉談章 *Xi-tan zhang* (nos. 275–276)

However, the original Chinese versions of (4), (6), (11), and (13) openly declare that they are created by the Chinese monks. They should be distinguished from the other nine, which are labelled as *wei-jing* 偽經 (or *yi-jing* 疑經) “fake sutras” and truly deserve the designation “Apocrypha.” Given such difference, it would be appropriate to relocate (4), (6), (11), and (13) to Chapter “VI. Other Buddhist Texts.”

The three fragments **no. 188–190** are identified as belonging to the same scroll of a “Commentary to *Vajracchedikāsūtra*” (pp. 85–87). However, the reference in “Edition: BTT XLVII: #28” actually includes the edition of U 1788, the parallel text of **no. 188**. On the facsimile of **no. 189** (Plate 5, fig. 3) published in this volume, one can find three Chinese verses written by the Old Uyghur scribe followed by the literal Old Uyghur translations respectively. They reads: 聞法能總持 *no[m āšid.....] alqu nom-lariγ / 聞法不造惡 *nom āši[d.....] ayiγ qilinč-lariγ / 聞法智 (知) 業果 *nom āši[d.....]ki törlüg qilinč-larnıñ tüš-in*. These verses are excerpts from the *śloka* in *Zheng-fa nian-chu jing* 正法念處經 (T. 721, v. 17, 0376c16–17).**

Among the five fragments in the subgroup “*Garbhāparimocanasūtra*” (**nos. 194–198**), **nos. 194, 195** and **197** are identified for the first time in this volume, with the former two being able to be jointed in one piece. The note as “Not edited” for **no. 196** should be removed, since it has actually been edited in BTT XXIII (pp. 162–163, 166, 172–174). For **no. 198**, the editors should have set another independent subgroup of 觀無量壽經 *Guan wu-liang-shou jing* “Infinite life *sūtra*” (T. 365).

Five subgroups of texts are included in Chapter “V. Tantric Texts”:

- (1) *Aparimitāyurjñānasūtra* (= *Amitāyus*, **nos. 277–290**)
- (2) *Āryasarvatahāgatoṣṇīṣasitātapatrāparājitānāmadhāraṇī* (**nos. 291–294**)
- (3) *Āryasarvadurgatipariśodhanyuṣṇīṣavijayanāmadhāraṇī* (= *Uṣṇīṣavijayadhāraṇī*, **nos. 295–297**)
- (4) *Pañcarakṣā* (**nos. 298–300**)
- (5) *Mañjuśrīnāmasaṃgīti* (**no. 301**).

In addition to the previously edited fragments, the editors newly identify another seven pieces (**nos. 277, 279, 281, 283, 286, 287, 288**) that belongs to the Old Uighur version of (1) *Amitāyus*. The editors also identify the Old Uighur version of (3) *Uṣṇṣaviṣayadhāraṇī* in the SI collection for the first time on three fragments (**no. 295–297**), two of which were wrongly identified as *dhāraṇī* in *Amitāyus* before. According to the previous studies referred to in the entry, **no. 298** is in fact a commentary to the “*Pañcarakṣā*,” but not the main text. It should be noted in “Contents” (p. 136).

Entries in Chapter “**VI. Other Buddhist Texts**” are categorized into nine subgroups:

- (1) Xuanzang biography (**nos. 302, 303**)
- (2) Buddha Maitreya texts (**nos. 304–310**)
- (3) Tāngrikān tegin tāngrim (**nos. 311–333**)
- (4) Caitya veneration (**nos. 334, 335**)
- (5) Buddhist poems (**nos. 336–344**)
- (6) Praise of *Dharmaprabhāsa* (**nos. 345–349**)
- (7) Confession texts (**nos. 350–352**)
- (8) Unidentified Buddhist texts (**nos. 353–371**)
- (9) Colophons of Buddhist texts

Except for one fragment of the *Maitrisimit* (**no. 304**), all the other six fragments of the second subgroup “Buddha Maitreya texts” are designated as new manuscripts to the text “Praise of Buddha Maitreya.” The facsimile of one of them, **no. 306**, is published in Plate 8 (fig. 2) in this volume. Although the editors suggested that it would be parallel to lines 1037–1046 of BTT III (p. 141), **no. 306** actually has another piece of text on its right half. The text is also related to the veneration of the Buddha Maitreya, but seems unattested before. Probably it is part of another praise of Buddha Maitreya. Based on the facsimile, we can read the text as follows:

No. 306 = SI 1835/verso (Kr IV/296)

- 1 [.....] 六 [.....]
- 2 burxan-lar uluṣī. arīy suv / [.....]
- 3 bālgūr+ay :: adroq adroq etig yarat[.....]
- 4 köngül-tin ötgürü toyru bālgūr’ay :: burxan la[r.....]
- 5 adaq ’āngrāk-lāri üzä irklädüktä bo [...yertin]
- 6 -čü yer suv-uy 三 ming 大 ming yertinčüg [.....]
- 7 irklämiš bolur-a :: kök qalīy tānginčä [...tužit]
- 8 -līy arslan-līy. tözün maitri bodis[tv y-a(?)]

“..... sixthe realm of the buddhas, the pure water...show yourself, ah! [With?] different kinds of decoration.... show yourself directly from the heart [of ...], ah! When the Buddhas step on...with their toes, they will have stepped on this world, on the great trichiliocosm In accordance with the heaven...of the [Tuṣita], of the lion. The noble bodhisattva Maitreya.”

No. 343, designated as “Chan Buddhist poem,” is the Old Uyghur translation of the Chinese text *Chan-men shi-er-shi* 禪門十二時 “Twelve hours for the Chan school,” which was one of the two sets of lyrics for the folk song *Shi-er-shi* 十二時 “Twelve hours” prevalent in Dunhuang during the 9th and 10th centuries. **No. 349**, grouped here in “Praise of Dharmaprabhāsa” is actually identified by the editors as Old Uyghur translation of *Ci-bei dao-chang chan-fa* in “notes” (p. 160), and thus should be included in subgroup (4) of Chapter IV.

Chapter “**VII. Science**” includes only 2 sorts of texts: the Old Uyghur translations of Chinese *Qian-zi-wen* 千字文 (no. 380–389) and *Kai-meng yao-xun* 開蒙要訓 (no. 390–409), both of which used to be popular in Dunhuang as textbooks for pupils to learn Chinese characters in the 9th and 10th centuries. Perhaps they should be better titled as “Education” or “Culture.” A further task in research of *Qian zi wen* text in Old Uyghur is a detailed comparison among the different manuscripts. According to previous studies, there are all together 5 manuscripts of *Qian zi wen* in Old Uyghur, 3 of which are preserved in the SI (Umemura/Zieme 2015: 3–4). The editors indicate the joining of fragments in “notes” of each entry, suggesting only 2 manuscripts: the first 6 entries belonging to one, while the latter 4 belonging to the other. However, **no. 382** has already been identified as a third manuscript in previous studies (Shōgaito/Yakup 2001: 4; Cf. Umemura/Zieme 2015: 4). Perhaps a note is needed if the editors propose here a new method. As for the *Kai meng yao xun* in Old Uyghur, all the 20 fragments belong to one manuscript, the only one discovered so far.

“**VIII. Other Religious Texts**” contains only “**Manichaean texts**” in this volume (no. 410–416). **No. 415** is a fragment of “Manichaean prayer text” with the provenance “Toyuk Mazar”, suggesting the activity of Manichaean followers in the famous Buddhist site for Old Uyghurs.

“**IX. Secular and Civil Documents**” includes nine subgroups:

- (1) Official decrees (**nos. 417–426**)
- (2) Sale contracts (**nos. 427–436**)
- (3) Loan contracts (**nos. 437–455**)
- (4) Other contracts (**nos. 455–462**)
- (5) Accounting records (**nos. 463–475**)
- (6) Other documents (**nos. 476–491**)
- (7) Letters (**nos. 492–508**)

(8) Secular notes (**nos. 509–554**)(9) Exercises (**nos. 555–558**)

The criteria for subgrouping is, however, not well explained in the volume. **No. 430** is catalogued in the subgroup “Sale contracts,” with a description “Contents: Slave sale and silver loan contract” (p. 199). The editors could have noted that it is not a valid contract but an exercise (cf. Matsui 2004, p. 49). Furthermore, two pieces of colophons by two other different hands on this manuscript should also be noted in this entry. Mistakenly categorized as “documents of loan (документы о займе)” in Liliya Tugusheva’s edition (Tugusheva 2013, p. 40, 3a3), **no. 439** (p. 203) is actually already identified as three pieces of administrative orders for compulsory requisitions by Matsui (Matsui 2004c: 18–20) and thus included in his forthcoming monograph for the same topic (BTT XLVIII: D1+D2+D3). It should therefore be listed in the subgroup “Official decrees.” In **no. 445**, the reference of “Tugusheva 2013: Pa10” should be corrected to “Tugusheva 2013: 3a10” (p. 206, both in “Edition” and “Facsimile”). As is correctly pointed out in “Contents,” **no. 455** is an “administrative order on requisition of flour” (p. 210), and should thus be moved to the subgroup “official decrees.” **No. 459** (pp. 211–212) is of the same case, which is an administrative decree of the Chaghatai Khanate. The first edition of the whole text is still in print (BTT XLVIII: F9), while “Matsui 2014: F9” in “Edition” is actually merely a quotation.

No. 488 (pp. 223–224) is designated as “testament,” and thus included in the subgroup “Other documents.” In Radloff’s tentative translation of the text (USp, pp. 212–213), he failed to interpret the key word appearing in each line. Favored by the facsimile published in this volume (Plate 18, fig. 1), we might now read the key word $\dot{C}YQRY = \dot{c}\ddot{y}r\ddot{r}$, which can be understood as “wheel, spinning wheel” or “bundle (of cotton)” (Wilkens 2021, 227), or $\dot{C}YQ^{\cdot}Y = \dot{c}\ddot{y}ay$ “poor,” though further investigations are necessary for interpretation of the historical background of this record. If we take the former reading, the text might be a record of provision or receipt of (spinning) wheels or (cotton) bundles from a number of persons, though the entity who provided or received the stuff is unknown. The first four lines of the text can be read $\text{ıbečın yıl aram ay [.....] } \dot{z}\dot{c}\ddot{y}r\ddot{r} \text{ bitildi } \text{ıfapzun tu-nung bir } \dot{c}\ddot{y}r\ddot{r} \text{ } \text{ınāčı-nıng üč küzlög bir } \dot{c}\ddot{y}r\ddot{r}$ “[on...] of the first month of the year of monkey, the (spinning) wheels [or (cotton) bundles] are written. Fapzun tu’s one wheel. İnāči’s one wheel for three autumns.”

No. 492, 493 and 494 (pp. 225–226) represents the famous long official letter in Old Uighur. The editors add in the notes a new fragment Dx 12921 to join them. After the first attempt to edit the major parts (**nos. 492 and 493**, Tugushva 1971), Gerard Clauson and Geng Shimin also published their editions respectively (Clauson 1973; Geng 2006, pp. 64–70), which should be referred to in **nos. 492 and 493**.

No. 553 is mentioned as “Not edited,” although its major part, “the praise of Wutaishan 五臺山,” has been thoroughly edited (Zieme 2016c: 120–122). It may be also noted that the text was written from right to

left in contrary to the Old Uyghur tradition. Contrarily, another fragment related to “the praise of Wutaishan,” **No. 554**, has not been edited but only quoted in Zieme 2016c.

Chapter “**X. Miscellaneous Texts**” contains 9 entries (**nos. 559–567**). **No. 567**, the only fragment in runic script in this volume, bears records of the historical events probably related to Toñuquq in a Manichaean context, which is worthy to note in “contents”; and “Erdal/Hao 2017” in “edition” should be corrected to “Erdal/Chen 2017,” whilst “Moriyasu 1989” has merely a quotation of the text, the revised version of which is included in “Moriyasu 2015a” (p. 258).

“**XI. Uyghur Texts in Brāhmī Script**” includes eighteen bilingual Buddhist manuscripts written in Brāhmī Script (**nos. 568–585**), each with Old Uyghur on one hand and Sanskrit or Tocharian B on the other hand. Two Sanskrit-Old Uyghur bilingual fragments (**nos. 576** and **577**) are obtained by Berezovsky in On-bash Ming-oi in the region of Kucha, providing precious evidence of Old Uyghur Buddhists’ activity in ancient Kucha. The editors described the “contents” of **no. 576** as “Abhidharma (?)” with doubt (p. 262), but it is actually excerpts from *Samyuktāgama*, as recently proved by Lundysheva, Maue and Wille 2021, no. 34.

“**XII. Chinese Texts in Uyghur Script**” includes eighteen manuscripts that are designated as Old Uyghur transcription of Chinese texts. The Chinese texts are *Li chan wen* (**nos. 586–591**), *Sheng miao jixiang zhenshi ming jing* 聖妙吉祥真實名經 (T. 1190; **nos. 592–598**), *Shengzhe wenshushili fa puti xin yuanwen* 聖者文殊師利發菩提心願文 (T. 1198; **no. 599**), *Si fen lu biqu jie ben* 四分律比丘戒本 (T. 1429; **nos. 600–601**) and *Muyu zan* 沐浴讚 (**nos. 602–603**). In addition to the fragments *Li chan wen* edited by Shōgaito, the editors identify a new piece (**no. 588**) which can be joined with **no. 587**. **No. 602**, described as “*Muyu zan* transcribed in Uyghur script” (p. 274), is indeed a pure translation into Old Uyghur language, as one can check according to the facsimile published in this volume (Plate 24; BTT XXXIV, pp. 81–85; Zieme 2020a). It should thus be catalogued in Chapter “**V. Other Buddhist Texts**.”

A few errors and omissions in “Index” and elsewhere should be mentioned. In “**Titles–Index**,” a few items should be supplemented to the subgroup “**Chinese titles**”: *Chan-men shi-er-shi* 禪門十二時 for **no. 343**; *Fo-shuo shi-li-jing* 佛說十力經 (T. 780) for **nos. 155–156**; *Jin-gang bo-re bo-luo-mi-duo-jing* 金剛般若波羅蜜多經 (T. 235) for **no. 153**; *Jin-guang-ming zui-sheng-wang-jing* 金光明最勝王經 (T. 655) for **nos. 157–159**. The title “*Da ci en si san zang fa shi zhuan* 大慈恩寺三藏法師傳” (p. 277) could be deleted, due to the recurrence of the same work after the next entry, in a more complete title as “*Da tang da ci en si san zang fa shi zhuan* 大唐大慈恩寺三藏法師傳” (T. 2053). In the subgroup “**Uyghur titles**,” we may add *Abitaki* for **nos. 167–168**. In “**Index (by titles)**” (p. 311), the Taishō number of 大乘大悲分陀利經 *Da-cheng da-bei fen-tuo-li-jing* should be “T. 158.” Reference of “UWN III” “UWV II” in **no. 298** should be added to “**Abbreviations**” as well as to “**References**.”

References (only for those not included in the volume)

- Clauson 1973:** Gerard Clauson. “Two Uygur administrative orders,” *Ural-Altaische Jahrbücher* 45. 213–222.
- Geng 2006:** Geng Shimin 耿世民. *Huihu wen shehui jingji wenshu yanjiu* 回鹘文社會經濟文書研究 [Studies of the Uighur civil documents], Beijing: Zhongyang Minzu Daxue Chubanshe.
- Lundysheva, Maue and Wille 2021:** Olga Lundysheva, Dieter Maue, and Klaus Wille. “Miscellanea in Brāhmī script from the Berezovsky and Krotkov collections (IOM, RAS),” *Written Monuments of the Orient*, vol. 7, No. 2 (14). 3–106.
- Wilkens 2021:** Jens Wilkens. *Handwörterbuch des Altuigurischen*, Göttingen: Universitätsverlag Göttingen.