

BOOK REVIEWS

the compilation of this dictionary during more than thirty years. The original draft of the dictionary was sent to the publisher in 1967 but it was lost during a hurried removal of the publisher's office. We must have the greatest admiration for the energy with which Nakamura recommenced the laborious task of compiling his dictionary for the second time.

As mentioned before this dictionary is meant in the first place for Japanese readers. However, more and more Western scholars are studying Chinese and Japanese Buddhist texts. The fact that this work is written in simple and clear Japanese will make it much easier for them to consult than other Japanese dictionaries. Nakamura's dictionary will be an indispensable tool for Buddhist scholars in Japan and the West for many years to come. Without doubt all users will be very grateful to Professor Nakamura for having devoted so many years to the compilation of this dictionary. The publisher deserves high praise for the beautiful and clear print and the solid binding.

J. W. DE JONG.

THE LION'S ROAR OF QUEEN ŚRĪMĀLĀ, A Buddhist Scripture on the Tathāgatagarbha Theory. Translated with Introduction and Notes by Alex Wayman and Hideko Wayman. Columbia University Press: New York & London, 1974, xvi + 142 pp.

The *Śrīmālā Sūtra* is one of the best-known scriptures of Mahayana Buddhism. It is noted for its unusual format, in which the Buddhist doctrine is elucidated by a pious lady devotee named Śrīmālā. To the Japanese, her name has been familiar since the time of Prince Shōtoku through his commentary on the sutra, the *Sbōmangyō-gisbo*. The focus of the Queen's elucidation is, as the subtitle of the present work indicates, the Tathāgatagarbha theory. According to this theory, which is based on the One Way (*ekayāna*) theory of the *Saddharmapundarika*, every sentient being without exception has the possibility of becoming a Buddha. This important work was veritably unknown to Western Buddhist studies until recent times when Dr. E. H. Johnston published the *Ratnagotravibhāga (Uttaratantra)* in which he quoted several passages from it as the main sources of the *tathāgatagarbha* doctrine. In his foreward to the text Dr. Johnston expressed his hope for the early translation of this scripture into a Western language. In this fine work by Dr. and Mrs. Wayman, this hope has now been realized.

The Lion's Roar of Queen Śrīmālā consists of an introduction (55 pages), translation with footnotes (pp. 57-113), and appendices consisting of a comparable table of section titles and diagrams made by past Chinese and Japanese writers, a list of works cited in Chi-tsang's commentary; a Glossary, Bibliography, and Index.

In the introduction the translators set forth their view concerning the history of the text, its structure, and its standpoint and doctrine. The most original of their assertions is that the *Śrīmālā* is "a composition of the Mahāsāṅghika sect" (preface). They attempt to prove this by citing wordings or meanings in the *Śrīmālā* that are similar to the Mahāsāṅghika doctrine, though this is done from rather sparse and limited sources. Bold hypotheses are sometimes useful in promoting Buddhist studies, but the present reviewer cannot help confessing that in this case the hypothesis would seem to be inadequate on the basis of available evidence. For example, the statement that the text is a product of South India in the Śātavāhana Dynasty is merely a guess. There is no proof that the *Mahāvastu*, a work of the Lokottaravādin school, one of the northern sub-sects of the Mahāsāṅghika, was known and used in southern Mahāsāṅghika sub-sects as well. It is unclear whether the translators maintain that the *Śrīmālā* alone belongs to the Mahāsāṅghika or that the Tathāgatagarbha theory in general comes from the Mahāsāṅghika. Any statement that a Mahāyāna scripture could be a production of the Hinayanic Sectarian Buddhism is not understandable either. Does it mean that this scripture was composed by someone who belonged to or came out of the Mahāsāṅghika? Or does it mean that the *Śrīmālā* belonged to the Mahāsāṅghika canon? In any case, to say at this stage of research, even as a hypothesis, that the present text has been modified in accordance with Mahāyāna doctrine from an original Mahāsāṅghika work, would be impossible. The relation between Mahāyāna Buddhism and Sectarian Buddhism is an important problem for future research, and the reviewer hopes that the authors will consider this problem in a wider scope before attempting to decide the position of the *Śrīmālā*.

Their translation is the result of long years' study of the available sources; the Sanskrit fragments cited in the *Ratnagoṭṭravibhāga* and other works, the Tibetan translation, the two Chinese translations, the commentaries in Chinese and Japanese, and the related works of modern scholars. Their method of translation, as expressed in the note, was "to reconstruct and render the original meaning of the scripture, as they came to understand it from the consensus of the versions." This is a reasonable course, and, in most cases, they are success-

ful in making clear the original meaning. In only one point do I have an objection to their evaluation of the Sanskrit fragments quoted in the *Ratnagoṭravibhāga*. They adopt the reading “*muktajñā*” and “*amuktajñā*” on the authority of the Tibetan and the later Chinese translation, which is a reversal of “*amuktajñā*” and “*muktajñā*” respectively, although the latter reading is supported by the earlier Chinese translation and all versions of the *Ratnagoṭravibhāga*. (Translation, p. 98, 99. Cf. Introduction, pp. 48–52. The same holds true for the reading “*muktajñāna*” and “*amuktajñāna*” in Translation, p. 105.) The reason for their decision is that they regarded the latter reading as a modification by the author of the *Ratnagoṭravibhāga*. It is difficult to understand why the translators prefer the versions of the later period (the later Chinese translation was made in the 8th century, and the Tibetan translation in the 9th century) to the versions of the earlier period (the earliest Chinese translation dates from 436; the Chinese translation of the *Ratnagoṭravibhāga* from 509–10, of which the Sanskrit original might have appeared in the early 5th century).

Another point worth noting is the chapter division, which was suggested by Chinese and Japanese commentaries. They adopt, with a slight modification, the 15 subdivisions given in the Koryo Tripitaka (the basic edition of the Taishō Tripitaka text), which in turn are based on the 16 names Śākyamuni gives in the epilogue as conveying the merits of the *Śrīmālā*. These subdivisions are then arranged into four main chapters, with a Prologue and Epilogue. The method by which the chapters and subdivisions are divided and the titles given to them, are their own.

- Chap. I. Eliminating all Doubts (sub. 1–2)
- II. Deciding the Cause (sub. 3–4)
- III. Clarifying the Final Meaning (sub. 5–13)
- IV. Entering the One Vehicle Path (sub. 14–15)

These titles are arrived at by breaking down the Chinese translation of the last, 16th title of the Sūtra: 斷一切疑決定了義入一乘道. The equivalent passage in the Tibetan translation reads: “the elucidation which eliminates all doubts, (and which shows) the final meaning (*nīṭartha*), the unique basis to be entered (*ekapratisarana*).” Although the combination of these four titles does not correspond exactly to the 16th title in the Sūtra, the present division well catches what the *Śrīmālā* wants to convey.

The translation is fluent, literal, and true to the original. The translators are to be praised for their contribution of introducing this important scripture to English readers. Some minor mistakes and misunderstandings of the Sanskrit

fragments and other versions as well as of general Buddhist usage will be listed below:

p. 60, l. 5: "a court official." Tib. *nan kor ma*. It must mean "a court lady." Her name in the Sanskrit original might be 'Candirā.'

p. 82, l. 1: The term *vibhaya-vāda* is mistranslated "analyzes and explains" (p. 81, last line). It should be treated as elsewhere as a technical term, associated with *ekāmsavāda* (see n. 65), and inserted following "not final meaning."

p. 88, l. 10: "From time immemorial, the nescience entrenchment has been unconscious." The same sentence appeared before (p. 84), where it was translated "the nescience entrenchment which has existed from beginningless time is unconscious," which is perhaps preferable.

p. 92, l. 1: "subjects (*dbarmin*) undeceived." This could better be rendered to mean "of an unignorant nature."

p. 93, l. 6-7: "The second one of these refuges is." It should be "These two refuges are," as it refers to Dharma and Sangha in contrast to Buddha. And hence the sentences which follow the above should be changed: the Dharma which teaches the path of One Vehicle *ends with the realization* of the Dharma-kāya, and beyond this [realization] there *remains nothing to be done by the Dharma* which teaches the Path of One Vehicle. (The *Ratnagotravibhāga* does not mistake the meaning of the *Śrīmālā* as the translators consider in note 73).

p. 98, l. 10: "knowing as liberated" for "*muktajñā*" may be all right from the term's literal similarity to "*krtajñā*" (knowing what is done), but who or what is "knowing as liberated"? The present reviewer believes that this particular "*muktajñā*" should be taken as "*amuktajñā*," in accordance with the Sanskrit version of the *Ratnagotra* (as discussed above), and should be translated: "never being isolated from (supreme) knowledge," or simply "unreleased from Wisdom" (see *Indo-Iranian Journal* Vol. xv, 4, 1973, p. 298).

p. 99, note 84 (on Voidness), l. 2: The meaning of the Sanskrit sentence means "Whatever is lacking in some place, one observes that *that place is void of that thing*."

p. 112, l. 11 from below: The 11th title should be translated "Teaching of the one refuge which is permanent, steadfast, calm, and eternal." Cf. the *Ratnagotravibhāga*, p. 20, 9-10: *esa ca nityadbruvativasāsvataikasarāṇanirdeśo vistareṇārya-śrīmālāsūtrānusāreṇānugantavyaḥ* (Tib. 'rtag pa g'yun drun sbi ba brtan pabi skyabs gcig pu' for 'nityadbruvativasāsvataikasarāṇa').

TAKASAKI JIKIDŌ