

Yasuhiro Sueki: *Bibliographical Sources for Buddhist Studies: from the Viewpoint of Buddhist Philology*

Second Edition Revised and Enlarged. Tokyo: International Institute for Buddhist Studies of the International College for Postgraduate Buddhist Studies, 2008. xxvii + 810 pp. ISBN 978-4-906267-61-3. 3,100 yen.

Jonathan A. Silk

© Springer Science+Business Media B.V. 2008

The book under review is a revision of a work initially published, under the same title, ten years before, to which subsequently were added three addenda. The work itself appeared in 1998 (xxii, 195 pp.), with Addenda I in 1999 (49 pp.), Addenda II in 2000 (viii, 72 pp.), and Addenda III in 2001 (xiv, 146 pp.). The present revision and enlargement almost doubles the length of the earlier work, not only bringing it up-to-date, but also adding significant material that was absent from the initial survey. It must be said at the outset that this bibliography is a monumental work, not only in extent but also in the scope of its coverage and the overall accuracy which it presents its contents. It is useful, reliable and comprehensive. It is, in these respects, precisely what one would wish it to be. Correctness in such a work, moreover, tends to be almost invisible; for most users, it is only the misstep that makes itself evident. To focus on rare oversights is not only completely unfair, but results in a gross misrepresentation of the work. But aside from praising a work of reference, what is a reviewer to do if not to point out the occasional item missed by the compiler, or his very infrequent slips? In the first place, then, deep appreciation must be expressed to the compiler for this useful and interesting volume. Secondary to this, some comments may be offered, purely in the spirit of moving us all a small step closer to impossible perfection and completion.

To begin, the title of the book may not exactly give an entirely clear picture of what it really contains, and the author, chief librarian at what is surely one of the best specialist libraries for the study of Buddhism in the world, that of the International Institute for Buddhist Studies in Tokyo, in his (extremely brief) 'Preface' may not

J.A. Silk (✉)

Instituut Kern, Universiteit Leiden, Postbus 9515, 2300 RA, Leiden, The Netherlands
e-mail: j.a.silk@hum.leidenuniv.nl

have sufficiently clearly indicated what it is he is attempting to do. Here is the entirety of his programmatic statement:

The development of Buddhist studies has caused not only an expansion and subdivision of the whole field of study, but also an increase in the number of books, journal articles and collected papers being written on the subject in many languages. Thus, it is increasingly difficult to know what kind of work has already been completed, or is now being undertaken, on a particular text or topic somewhere in the world. Bibliographical works have therefore come to play more important roles, offering timely presentations of relevant materials from bulky works for use in a specific field of research.

This work . . . aims at providing basic bibliographical sources for Buddhist studies from the viewpoint of Buddhist philology. The coverage of the main materials is a catalogue or list, a bibliography, bibliographical information, introduction, or survey on Buddhist texts General bibliographical works, and some specialists' surveys on histories or trends of Buddhist studies, are also recorded. In particular, the latter materials are of much benefit to those working in the field of Buddhist studies as they provide information on the merits and drawbacks of the different works. Some reviews on a particular work are cited to show not only additions or corrections but also scholarly evaluation of each title. Some related basic research works are also cited in order to give related information on a particular topic. In some cases brief annotations or contents of the works follow for the convenience of students of Buddhist studies and non-specialist librarians.

It must, therefore, be made clear that this is not a bibliography of Buddhist philology, but rather a bibliography of *bibliographies* of Buddhist philology. It is a guide to guides, a meta-resource. Rather than being a direct means of access to the sources, this is a means of access to those works which are, themselves, means of access. Therefore, for instance, neither the *Mahāvvyutpatti*, one of the fundamental lexicons of Indic Buddhist vocabulary, nor any other index or glossary, finds a place here, and its editions (and indices) are not mentioned, but Claus Vogel's studies on Indian and Buddhist lexicography, for example, within which the *Mahāvvyutpatti* is discussed, are duly listed. Likewise, catalogues of Sanskrit manuscript collections are generally not listed, but Yuyama's list of such catalogues (B001) is noted. However, this approach has been followed somewhat inconsistently, as I will note below. That said, if one wants to learn the outlines of what has been written about what has been written about (sic!) Buddhist literature in Indic, Tibetan (including Bon materials), Chinese, Korean, Japanese, Vietnamese, Central Asian languages, Mongol and Manchu, there is no better source.

Although the work is divided into sections, denoted A through M, with an appendix and indices, in fact it falls into two main parts. The first section, comprising A through L, lists up works that deal (in one way or another) with philologically focused Buddhist studies. Section M, in contrast, provides what the author terms a "Bio-bibliographical Survey on Persons." I will return to this below.

The first portion itself falls into two parts. A–J deal with texts, while K lists "General Bibliography [*sic* singular] of Buddhist Studies" and L "Histories and Trends in

Buddhist Studies.” It would have been a boon for the reader if these sections, logically distinct as they are, were more clearly distinguished in the typographic or structural presentation of the work as a book.

After a brief listing in part A of “Buddhist Texts in General,” section B commences with “Buddhist Sanskrit Texts,” C lists up works dealing with “Pāli and Related Buddhist Literature”, D “Tibetan Buddhist Texts”, E “Mongolian and Manchu Buddhist Texts”, F “Buddhist Texts Written in Central Asian Languages”, G “Chinese Buddhist Texts”, H “Vietnamese Buddhist Texts”, I “Korean Buddhist Texts” and J “Japanese Buddhist Texts”. Each section is sub-divided, as appropriate. Thus the section on Sanskrit texts separately includes headings on “Early Buddhist Texts”, Mahāyāna texts, Abhidharma, Madhyamaka, Yogācāra, Epistemology, Letters, the date of the Buddha, and Inscriptions. It must be noted, of course, that these classifications are intended to reflect the history of the field of Buddhist Studies, and not necessarily Sueki’s notion of how the field *should* be organized, so there is no point in, for instance, critiquing the idea of “Early Buddhist Texts” or arguing that a distinction between Madhyamaka, Yogācāra, and Epistemology cannot help but be artificial. The organization is no doubt solely intended to be useful, and not ideological.

The section dealing with the Chinese Buddhist canon(s) is particularly detailed and useful. It contains, in addition to bibliographic references to catalogues, surveys of manuscripts and so on, frequent analysis of works referred to and excellent short summaries of the details of traditional block-print editions. The section on the history of Buddhist Studies, although it may not fit within the otherwise logical scheme of “Buddhist philology,” is also excellent and very useful and comprehensive.

While one might argue whether the way Sueki has chosen to arrange his work is always the best, the utility of *some* organization becomes transparently evident when one compares Sueki’s work with, for instance, the online “Bibliography of Buddhist Studies Bibliographies in Western Languages,” compiled by Marcus Bingenheimer, and available in a March 2008 revision at <http://buddhistinformatics.chibs.edu.tw/~mb/tools/bibls/biblBibl.html>. Being nothing more than an alphabetized list, this is almost impossible to use in any sort of intelligent way, for Buddhist scholar and non-specialist librarian alike. This is not to say that a paper bibliography is inherently superior to one in online (including hypertext) format. In fact, as I will suggest below, there is a place for both sorts of presentations. In either case, organization is crucial. Therefore, it is disappointing to have to state that it is a bit difficult to discern the intended scope of Sueki’s work, even when one works with it for a time. For instance, in section B1 “Collection Catalogue” (why not plural?) under “Buddhist Sanskrit Texts,” as I alluded to above, some catalogues of collections of Buddhist Sanskrit manuscripts are listed, but most are not. It may be that those catalogues already listed in Yuyama’s 1992 booklet on *Buddhist Sanskrit manuscript collections* (B001) are deemed not in need of enumeration, but this is nowhere indicated, and a number of items which *are* cited (e.g., B010, 012, 013, etc.) are older than 1992. Moreover, the utility of any work is much reduced if one must look elsewhere rather than in a single place to locate some listings. While it is true that some of the (“missing”) relevant works are listed under the bio-bibliographic listing of respective authors (e.g., under Bendall one does find reference to his catalogue of the Cambridge collection of Buddhist Sanskrit manuscripts), this requires one to know already that a work exists, and what the author’s name is, before searching for it.

This can lead to other problems. How is one to know whether Nagao's study of the Ryūkoku University Tibetan collection has escaped Sueki's notice, or whether for some reason it did not fit his criteria for inclusion? See: "Chibetto bunken ryakumokuroku (Aoki Bunkyō 1886–1956 shōraibon)" チベット文献略目録 (青木文教 1886–1956 将来本) [A short catalogue of Tibetan literature, from the collection brought back by Aoki Bunkyō]. In *Dai Gojūhakkai Daizōe Tenkan Mokuroku* 第五十八回大蔵会展覧目録 (A catalogue of the exhibition held in the Library of Ryūkoku University, Ōmiya campus, Nov. 17–18, 1972) (Kyoto: Ryūkoku Daigaku, 1972): 3–14. One learns by looking at the biographical note on Nagao that Sueki is aware of Nagao's "Katomandu no bukkyō shahon tenseki" カトマンドウの仏教写本典籍 [Buddhist manuscripts in Sanskrit from Kathmandu]. *Iwai Hakase Koki Kinen Tenseki Ronshū* 岩井博士古希記念典籍論集 (Tokyo: Iwai Hakase Koki Kinen Jigyōkai 岩井博士古希記念事業会, 1963): 8–25, but the same general topic has been at least touched on more recently by Dragomir Dimitrov, "Kaiser Shamsher, his Library and his Manuscript Collection," in the *Newsletter of the NGMCP* [Nepal German Manuscript Cataloguing Project] 3 (2007): 26–36, and this is apparently unknown to Sueki or, again, did not meet his criteria (or appeared too late for inclusion?). In fact, every issue of this *Newsletter of the NGMCP* is important for bibliographic knowledge of Nepalese Buddhist Sanskrit texts, and some mention would have been helpful, all the more so since all publications are available freely on the web. (An earlier CD ROM catalogue of the Nepal German Manuscript Preservation Project is listed [B011], but not the current website: http://www.uni-hamburg.de/ngmcp/about_e.html, or <http://134.100.72.204:3000> for the searchable catalogue). In the same vein, how is one to know whether Sueki does not know about, or just did not, for some reason, choose to list, Mitsutoshi Moriguchi, *A Catalogue of the Buddhist Tantric Manuscripts in the National Archives of Nepal and Keshar Library* (Tokyo: Sankibo Busshorin, 1989)? Such questions could go on and on. Another useful work may have appeared too late to have been taken into account: Nobuyuki Yamagiwa, "Vinaya Manuscripts: State of the Field" in Konrad Klaus and Jens-Uwe Hartmann, eds., *Indica et Tibetica: Festschrift für Michael Hahn zum 65. Geburtstag von Freunden und Schülern überreicht*. Wiener Studien zur Tibetologie und Buddhismuskunde 66 (Wien: Arbeitskreis für Tibetische und Buddhistische Studien Universität Wien, 2007): 607–616. This is a translation of "Ritsuzō kankei shahon kenkyū no genjō" 律藏関係写本研究の現状, *Indogaku bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 印度學佛教學研究 52/1 (2003), 333–339, which itself Sueki duly notices (B089).

Although, again, the compiler has not made explicit his criteria for coverage, given the sort of references which are in fact included, it is puzzling to find lack of any reference to the extensive analysis of each individual text, and accompanying excellent bibliography, in the reproduction of three sections of the Derge Tanjur published by Tokyo University, the Dbu ma (Madhyamaka), Sems tsam (Cittamātra) and Tshad me (Pramāṇa) sections (K. Hayashima, Z. Yamaguchi, J. Takasaki, N. Hakamaya, Y. Ejima, eds., *sDe dge Tibetan Tripiṭaka bstan ḥgyur preserved at the Faculty of Letters, University of Tokyo* [Tokyo: Sekai Seiten Kankō Kyōkai, 1977–1984]). Although it is now out of date in some respects, and there is no need to reproduce the actual xylographic texts, since in the intervening years other editions of the Derge

Tanjur have become available, the invaluable bibliographic compilations in these volumes should be made more readily available.

Regarding issues of different Kanjur versions, several important contributions of Michael Zimmermann are not mentioned: “A Second Tibetan Translation of the *Tathāgātagarbhasūtra* in the Newark Manuscript Kanjur from Bathang: A Translation of the Early Period (*snga dar*),” *Transactions of the International Conference of Eastern Studies* 43 (1998): 33–50; “The Tabo Fragments and the Stemma of the Tibetan *Tathāgātagarbhasūtra*,” in *The Many Canons of Tibetan Buddhism. PIATS 2000: Tibetan Studies: Proceedings of the Ninth Seminar of the International Association for Tibetan Studies*, Leiden 2000, Brill’s Tibetan Studies Library 2/10, H. Blezer, A. McKay and C. Ramble (eds.) (Leiden, Boston, Cologne: Brill, 2002): 177–196; “A Preliminary Analysis of the *Tathāgātagarbhasūtra* as Found in the Lang Kanjur,” appendix to Klaus-Dieter Mathes’ “Establishing the Succession of the Sakya Lamas of Nāsar Gompa and Lang Gompa in Dolpo (Nepal),” *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens* 47 (2003): 104–105.

As for Chinese sources, with reference to the Second Korean edition, it might be helpful to refer to the following study of Sugi’s editorial work: Robert Buswell, “Sugi’s *Collation Notes* to the Koryō Buddhist Canon and Their Significance for Buddhist Textual Criticism,” *Journal of Korean Studies* 9/1 (Fall 2004), pp. 129–184. Regarding the Fangshan stone canons, it might be worthwhile to note what must be one of the first publications on this topic: Le Commandant Vaudescal, “Les pierres gravées du Chê King Chān 石經山 et le Yūn Kiū Sséu 雲居寺,” *Journal Asiatique* 11th series, volume 3 (1914): 375–459.

I referred above to online sources. As examples of online sources which either duplicate, or in many cases surpass, preexisting printed sources, one might refer to an ongoing project to produce a multi-lingual database of text parallels, to replace the classic list of Akanuma (C121), detailing parallels between Pāli Nikāyas and Chinese translations: <http://www.suttacentral.net/>. Likewise, there is now an online catalogue of the Mongol Kanjur: <http://andrewglass.org/mong.php>. Concerning this, the site explains:

This catalogue aims to provide a convenient means of accessing the texts in the printed edition of the Mongolian Kanjur in 108 volumes, published in New Delhi by Lokesh Chandra, 1973–1974. The catalogue consists of a full list of the 1,161 text titles in the collection together with indices for the titles in Mongolian, Sanskrit, and Tibetan. There is also a concordance of text numbers from the Peking edition of the Tibetan Kanjur. Cross references between related texts have been marked with hyperlinks in the catalogue. The data in the catalogue comes from various sources. The Mongolian titles and location information are based on the contents pages found in the individual volumes in Lokesh Chandra’s edition. These titles were checked against Ligeti’s catalogue and his cross-references were incorporated. Where the two differ, I have generally followed Ligeti. The Tibetan and Sanskrit titles are from an electronic edition of Suzuki’s catalogue of the Peking Kanjur.

The Early Buddhist Manuscripts Project (EBMP) website at the University of Washington not only is the home of the online Gāndhārī dictionary, but also contains the best catalogue of Kharoṣṭhī inscriptions, Gāndhārī Buddhist manuscripts

and secular documents, and coins with Kharoṣṭhī legends, as well as an ever growing bibliography of Gandhāran studies (<http://www.ebmp.org/>). Not everything is being replaced by online sources, of course. For instance, while the *Critical Pāli Dictionary* is online, the valuable Epilegomena of Helmer Smith (C141) appears to have not (yet) been incorporated: <http://pali.hum.ku.dk/cpd/>.

When online sources are recorded, sometimes the wording of their description can be somewhat misleading. Thus K034 notices the INBUDS database, but this most useful tool does not “contain over 44,000” articles. Rather, it offers references to articles; no texts are available (so far) from this site. While bibliographies of doctoral dissertations are mentioned, it is not noted that a great many doctoral dissertations are available from ProQuest for (paid) download as PDF files, and it should be possible to search for almost any thesis through this or another system without charge.

As noted above in Sueki’s statement of his goals, he occasionally mentions reviews of books, in order to provide some perspective on their worth. Sometimes very useful references are overlooked, however. Had Sueki been aware of the quite critical review of the third edition of Leslie Grey’s *A concordance of Buddhist birth stories* (C157) in *Indo-Iranian Journal* (46/3 [2003]: 286–289, by Burkhard Scherer), he might have noted that the reviewer recommends readers to instead make use of the second edition of this work, along with a separately published supplement, rather than the third. Although hardly as important, since Sueki took the trouble to refer to a two page review of Almond (L259), he might have also referred to a more extensive consideration: “The Victorian Creation of Buddhism,” *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 22 (1994): 171–196 (by, I am afraid, the present writer). At the same time, it is hardly likely that there are no significant reviews of the next item, T. Trautmann’s *Aryans and British India* (1997), which leads us to ask why such a work, and the next *Who was who in British India*, and many such others, is even included at all. While it is, perhaps, in principle, better to be more than less inclusive, surely if one starts down this road, there is no possible end to potentially, but practically speaking not centrally, relevant works. Again, if Sueki had taken the step of making clear his criteria, such discussions would be rendered moot. As a final note in this regard, a propos the late Erik Zürcher (M892), recorded in the bio-bibliographic survey, Sueki has overlooked the (incomplete and partly wrong) bibliography by S. Teiser in the third “edition” (actually, there is no change of text, so it is rather a matter of retypesetting) of the classic *Buddhist Conquest of China* (2007). I will publish a more complete listing in my introduction to the forthcoming compilation of Zürcher’s articles on Buddhism (Brill, 2009?).

As mentioned above, a significant portion of the work is dedicated to a “Bio-bibliographical survey.” What are the criteria for inclusion of individuals in this survey? These are never so much as mentioned, and it is difficult to imagine a coherent set of standards, since a number of individuals who have contributed to Indic or Chinese studies, but not to the study of Buddhism, are also listed. It is hard to understand, despite their scholarly greatness, the purpose of listing, for instance, the Jaina specialist Jozef Deleu, the linguist Antoine Meillet, Georges Dumézil, Rudolf van Roth, Paul Thieme, Jacob Wackernagel, or on the Sinological side Bernard Karlgren (and if he is to be listed, why not mention the available biography: Göran Malmqvist, *Bernhard Karlgren: ett forskarporträtt* [Stockholm: Norstedts, 1995], this provided with a

detailed review in English by Lothar von Falkenhausen in *China Review International* 8 [2001]: 15–33?), and so on.

Scholars are listed in the “Bio-bibliographical survey” in the order of their date of birth, not alphabetically. This has a certain logic to it, but requires that if one wants to look for a particular scholar one must turn to the index, rather than simply paging through, unless one happens to have an excellent sense of relative chronology. Why some scholars in the lists are given their full names and others not is also not clear. Thus we get Émile Charles Marie Senart, but only Étienne Lamotte instead of Étienne Paul Marie. While this is simply inconsistent, what is more difficult is that when full names are given there is almost never any indication of how a reader might search for an individual. This can be a problem if the scholar did not publish under the name cited. Just a few examples may suffice: One will be hard pressed to find any study written by Friedrich Albrecht Weber, but Albrecht Weber is well known; who is *Karl Louis* Rudolf Otto? Who *Otto Max* Helmuth von Glasenapp, who *Ernest Julius* Walter Simon? And who *Adolf* Wilhelm Ludwig Rau (although it is obvious why he might have stopped using his given name)? If the point is to (also) help out non-specialist librarians, this is to put a stumbling block before the blind. And again here we may raise the question of criteria: why are some Indologists mentioned, and others not? Is it that only those scholars whose works have been graced by a published bibliography are mentioned? Why is James Legge not mentioned among Sinologists, since he is not only a translator of the record of the Buddhist pilgrim Faxian, but the subject of an extensive study (Norman J. Girardot, *The Victorian Translation of China: James Legge's Oriental Pilgrimage* [Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002])? H. A. Giles, another translator of Faxian, is also not given an entry, but Alfred Forke merits one. Why is Pelliot listed under those who contributed to the study of Chinese Buddhism, rather than as a Sinologist? As far as I know, Pelliot had little interest in Buddhism per se, dealing with it only as a necessary element in his other studies, mostly linguistic. So too it is odd to see listed as scholars of Chinese Buddhism H. Maspero and Granet (listed under Paul Marcel although, as far as I know, he did not use the name Paul, at least professionally).

Finally, some misprints are easily corrected: C175: a bibliographic essays > essay; D106: unpublished work in 1934 > of 1934; G434: Erick > Erik; K137: Doctoral dissertation > dissertations. Others might cause confusion: G044.2: In practice of the light > In praise of the light; L197: Dendai > Gendai. A propos the very first entry in the bio-bibliographical survey, I expect that Dr. Schwarzschild/Hercus, in spite of her great (scholarly) flexibility, would be surprised to find herself a Latino; for Luis Anna read Luise Anna. Although not an error, why is Leiden spelled (L11.2.8.1) Leyden, in archaic orthography? From the opposite point of view, as it were, it would have been helpful to many readers, no doubt, to note that J. S. Speyer's name was often written Speijer (ij and y [ÿ] being identical in modern Dutch orthography). Some statements are simply made without sufficient caution: regarding L044, only *some* of J. W. de Jong's numerous reviews were reprinted in the 1979 collection of his studies, not “de Jong's reviews up to 1977.”

Some less crucial matters: No long vowels are marked in the Japanese proper name entries, although titles are scientifically transcribed. It is a relatively simple

thing for a Japanese specialist librarian like Sueki to make a very good guess at the correct reading of Japanese proper names, but often very difficult for foreigners (and even for many younger Japanese, let it be confessed), and ignoring marked vowel length is certainly easier than trying to reconstruct it. In this regard as well, it would have been good to note that some people (and some library catalogues) romanize Japanese names with intervocalic *-s-* in places in which Sueki uses *-z-*, such as Sakaki Ryōzaburō or Matsumoto Bunzaburō. If one does not know this, it is liable to cause confusion. Some Japanese book titles in references are not romanized, meaning that some readers (such as, again, the non-specialist librarian whom Sueki professes to have had in mind) will find it impossible to locate them without a transcription.

The Appendix gives a short list of periodicals, but it does not list some of the major journals publishing articles on Buddhism (such as *Asiatische Studien / Études Asiatiques* or even the iconic *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū*); is the point to list only those journals that have been indexed? But in a computerized age, with resources such as JSTOR, such a distinction is nearly meaningless. Again, if Sueki had taken the trouble to explain his decisions, one would have a better idea how to evaluate them.

At the very end, the subject index is very incomplete, and in some respects not very useful. This, and a number of other shortcomings referred to above, could be avoided by a web-based presentation. Among other things, this would allow a graphical reorganization that the economics of print make difficult. As I noted above, it is often difficult to simply navigate the sections of the work, which seem sometimes to run together. This is no doubt in large part due to the economy of printing, which wishes to avoid large blank spaces. In a web-based format, this is not an issue, and ample indenting, nesting, color-coding and such devices could be used to separate materials. It goes without saying that another huge advantage is the ability to flexibly correct, expand and link. In fact, as time goes by, it will become increasingly easy to link directly to sources themselves, to refer between sources and so on. The key is dynamic flexibility, and the provision for expansion. For instance, it is entirely imaginable right now that most book reviews could be linked to the works to which they refer, that the names of authors automatically access their biographical and bibliographical data, that primary sources and their catalogues and indices are linked, and so on. It might even prove possible, should Sueki be willing to produce an online version of his superb bibliographic guide, for the International Institute for Buddhist Studies to make an arrangement with one or more online booksellers or, as the case might be, other institutes, to provide links for certain publications, such that some percentage of sales goes back to supporting the site itself. The limits here are those of the imagination.

Let me hasten to add that I, as perhaps others of my generation, greatly appreciate the printed format of the volume. I read best not at a screen, but with a book before me. But for such a type of reference work as this, if a choice needs to be made, the obviously more flexible option is the online format. Moreover, since the book was obviously created on a computer, the data already exists, and while the process of encoding its contents (in XHTML or the like) is certainly nontrivial, it could be done without too much trouble, I imagine. This future online version should also come

with a comments, additions and corrections page, such that users could constantly improve the site.

In conclusion, it is a pleasure to welcome this valuable and detailed tool, and an obligation to express the wish that an enhanced version will appear in a more dynamic form in the near future.

As the review above was in final proof stage, several small points were brought to my attention by the author:

More correctly, the author is librarian at the International College for Postgraduate Buddhist Studies Library. He points out that, although he did not clarify this principle, since works including Moriguchi's *Catalogue of the Buddhist Tantric Manuscripts* are listed by Yuyama 1992, he has omitted them. In another case, indeed Sueki does mention the volumes of the Derge Tanjur published by the University of Tokyo—not with other Tanjurs under Tibetan works, however, but rather under those dealing with Sanskrit (B082). Finally, the names of James Legge (M829c) and H.A. Giles (L 380, 388) are not entirely absent, but they are not given entries of their own.