ACTA ASIATICA

BULLETIN

OF

THE INSTITUTE OF EASTERN CULTURE

121

The Heart Sūtra Revisited:
The Frontier of Prajñāpāramitāhṛdaya Studies

THE TŌHŌ GAKKAI

TOKYO 2021

The *Heart Sūtra* as *Dhāraṇī*

Jonathan A. Silk

In loving memory of my dearest friend Stefano Zacchetti (1968–2020),
who forgot far more about Prajñāpāramitā than I will ever know

Many consider the *Prajñāpāramitāhṛdaya*, the famous "Heart Sūtra," to be one of the most important Buddhist scriptures, and the attention given the text in a variety of traditions might seem to support such a claim.[1)] But it seems to me meaningless to speak even of relative importance without clear delineation of a frame for such a judgement. We must, then, in the first place ask how, by whom, and why the *Heart Sūtra* was treated in ways which suggest its importance. One way to try to answer such a question is to compare the way(s) the *Heart Sūtra* has been treated with the manners of treatment of other texts. As the title of this essay suggests, I here propose that the *Heart Sūtra* was, in some contexts, as a whole treated as a *dhāraṇī*, a treatment which invites comparison with the broader genre of *dhāraṇī* sūtras. This cannot, of course, entirely explain the valuation placed on the *Heart Sūtra* in every circumstance. Rather, the goal here is much more modest: to account for *some* of the ways in which the text has been used.

Modern scholarship has primarily approached the *Heart Sūtra* in the context of the Prajñāpāramitā literature. This stance is amply vindicated in an Indian context by the extensive commentarial literature the text has generated, which approaches it from a Madhyamaka or a Yogācāra standpoint.[2)] The scripture has also been considered, at least in a Tibetan context, as tantric, though it should be stressed that this in no way indicates *per se* that the text as a whole was seen as a *dhāraṇī*. Tibetan sources, which naturally do classify the *Heart Sūtra* as a Perfection of Wisdom text, debate whether it also belongs among the tantras, namely as a *kriyā tantra*, a

1) Since this paper was imagined in the first place primarily for an audience interested in the *Heart Sūtra*, readers familiar with the *dhāraṇī* literature will find much that is common knowledge, and vice versa. I hope that I may be forgiven if as a result I have fallen between two stools.

2) Perhaps the most comprehensive appraisal of this literature is that in Watanabe and Takahashi 2016.

classification which indeed includes the vast majority of so-called *dhāraṇī sūtra*s.[3] While some scholastic authors disagreed, those who edited the Kanjur collections usually placed it in both the Prajñāpāramitā and Tantric sections.[4] At least part of the reasoning for this decision appears to have been that, first, the text contains a *mantra*, and second, that there exist *sādhana*s and other tantric ritual works written on its basis. We need not consider here the possible differences between *mantra* and *dhāraṇī*, but the Sanskrit of the *Heart Sūtra* itself speaks of its appended formula, the famous *gate gate pāragate pārasaṁgate bodhi svāhā*, as *mantra*.

There are two broad recensions of the *Heart Sūtra*, conventionally referred to as Long and Short. The former contains the usual stock opening and closing formulae expected of sūtras, while the latter does not. The Indian tradition knows only the Long, which is preserved in a number of Nepalese manuscripts,[5] some of which explicitly name the whole text a *dhāraṇī*. Sanskrit manuscripts from Nepal typically cite the text by its (conventional) length, denoting it with variations on *Pañcaviṁśatikā Prajñāpāramitāhṛdaya*. To this manuscripts sometimes append the explicit designation *nāma dhāraṇī*.[6] Moreover, as Watanabe reminds us, "Many of the manuscripts from Nepal are included together with other sūtras in 'Dhāraṇī Collections' (*Dhāraṇī-saṁgraha*)."[7] These collections, that is, contain the entire text, and not simply the short *mantra*. Given this, it is slightly confusing that Watanabe seemingly cannot decide whether the *Heart Sūtra* as such is a *dhāraṇī*. He

3) This is not the place to discuss in detail what is meant by 'tantric', but it should be noted that there are very significant differences between many of the works classified as *kriyā tantra*s and those in the other classes. As a whole I would certainly maintain that there is nothing meaningfully 'tantric' about the texts I treat in this paper, but a discussion of this topic would take us rather far afield.

4) Silk 1994: 27–30.

5) Watanabe 2016: 23 mentions the figure of 40 manuscripts. See Suzuki 1995.

6) Discussed by Watanabe 2016 ≈ 2009: 2–11 from back. For examples see (from the blog of Jayarava; I have not checked his transcriptions) Cambridge Add 1553: https://prajnaparamitahrdaya.wordpress.com/2015/11/30/cambridge-manuscript-add-1553-ne/: *āryyapañcaviṁśatikā prajñāpāramitāhṛdaya nāma dhāraṇī samāpta*; Add 1164: https://prajnaparamitahrdaya.wordpress.com/2015/12/02/cambridge-manuscript-add-1164-nh/: *āryyaśrīpañcavinsatikā prajñāpāramitāhṛdaya nāma dhāraṇī parisamāpta*. I do not enter here into the question of the usage of the suffix *hṛdaya*, which signifies a précis and can certainly indicate an extracted essence of a larger text. Though no doubt important for understanding the *Heart Sūtra* overall, it is not a crucial question at present. The term is mentioned in a Tibetan context by Mkhas grub rje in Lessing and Wayman 1968: 116–118n18, although this discussion is not very useful for us. I am not aware of other texts which plausibly had *hṛdaya* in their titles likewise having been treated *in toto* as *dhāraṇī*s: see for instance the *Shih-i-mien shen-chou hsin ching* 十一面神呪心經 (T. 1071), and the *Amoghapāśahṛdaya* (*Pu-k'ung-chüan-so shen-chou hsin ching* 不空羂索神呪心經 [T. 1094], *Pu-k'ung-chüan-so chou hsin ching* 不空羂索呪心經 [T. 1095]).

7) Watanabe 2016: 23–24.

writes, "Even though it does not in fact constitute a *dhāraṇī*, among the several designations of this sūtra there are some that declare it to be a *dhāraṇī*."[8] However, he also avers, "The titles…*Pañcaviṁśatikā Prajñāpāramitā-hṛdaya-dhāraṇī* and…*Pañcaviṁśatikā Prajñāpāramitā-nāma-dhāraṇī*…clearly indicate that this sūtra is a *dhāraṇī*."[9] Further, referring to a number of examples, he writes, "[I]mportant characteristics of these Sanskrit manuscripts include the fact that they have the qualifier 'in twenty-five lines' (*pañcaviṁśatikā*) not found in Chinese translations, almost all identify the *Prajñāpāramitā-hṛdaya* as a *dhāraṇī*, and many of them did not circulate independently but were included in collections of *dhāraṇī*s (*Dhāraṇī-saṁgraha*)."[10] In fact, there is significant evidence that it is not only the *mantra* text contained in the sūtra but the sūtra *as a whole* that was considered as *dhāraṇī*. This does not mean it was always seen that way, or by everyone, but it does show that there existed (and perhaps still exist) at least in Nepalese contexts those who understood the *Heart Sūtra* as such to be a *dhāraṇī*.[11]

There is no question that many, even most, Buddhist scriptures were composed with the expectation that audiences (which may have been limited to monastics or scholastics) could understand those scriptures on a lexical and syntactic level—that is, understand them in an ordinary sense. Yet it is also clear that a special type of text did not partake in that expectation, namely the *mantra* or *dhāraṇī* (or differently named similar works). The topic under consideration here is one case in which there appears to have been a change of status of a scripture from the former to the latter category, a sort of generalization of the category of *dhāraṇī* to encompass a whole

8) Watanabe 2016: 21.

9) Watanabe 2016: 24.

10) Watanabe 2016: 25. It is worth noting that there is something strange with the idea that the Long text is 25 ślokas (800 syllables), while the Short version is said to be 14 ślokas (a mere 448 syllables). I thank Paul Harrison for bringing this point to my attention.

11) I am certainly not the first to say this. It is at least implied already, for instance, by Winternitz 1927: 381. As below, most of the evidence discussed here is from East Asia, and similar conclusions have been drawn on that basis. In the context of the *dhāraṇī* pillar at the Ti-tsang-ssu 地藏寺 in K'un-ming 昆明 (for illustrations see https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/Category:Dizang_Si_Jingchuang), for instance, Mori n.d. wrote that "historically [the *Heart Sūtra*] circulated as a *dhāraṇī* scripture" (歴史的には陀羅尼經典として流布していた). This K'un-ming pillar contains the *Heart Sūtra* along with several vow texts (Howard 1997: 37), and, according to Howard, 38 *dhāraṇī* texts, including the *Uṣṇīṣavijayā*, all written in Siddham; see below.

Although much of the evidence I will offer comes from East Asia, when possible I refer to texts in their Indic versions. Teasing apart the developments undergone by the *dhāraṇī* literature as it made its way into China is a task far beyond the scope of this short paper, and one barely undertaken by scholars so far. For a sobering look at only one small piece of the puzzle, see Forte Unpublished.

work.[12] The existence of multiple commentaries on the *Heart Sūtra* in Sanskrit, Tibetan and Chinese traditions amply shows that many scholars felt that they could understand the scripture in a commonsense way. But there is also simultaneously evidence that the text was treated as *dhāraṇī*s are commonly treated, although—save perhaps for the Nepalese evidence cited above—most of this seems to come from East Asia.[13] If the *Heart Sūtra* is not the unique example of this process, it is perhaps the most prominent one.[14]

Our earliest datable evidence for the *Heart Sūtra* comes from a Chinese inscription of 661 found at Fang-shan 房山, some 12 years after the text is recorded as having been translated by Hsüan-tsang 玄奘 in 649.[15] The earliest source is not, as was long thought, the so-called Hōryūji 法隆寺 palm leaf manuscript, which is certainly of a considerably later date than the 609 CE long claimed for it. This "Hōryūji palm leaf" manuscript of the Sanskrit text of the Short *Heart Sūtra* seems not to be written on palm leaf after all, and even more surely not to have been written by an Indian scribe.[16] What seems most likely, rather, is that it is a secondary

12) This change, if that is what it was, need not necessarily be understood as having a chronological dimension. By this I mean, it is very plain that the *Heart Sūtra* continued to be treated as "meaningful," that is, subject to exegesis, long after, I assert, it was *also* understood in its entirety as a *dhāraṇī*.

13) In fact, there is little evidence for the life of most texts in Indian contexts. Some *dhāraṇī*s, to be sure, are found inscribed throughout the Indian world (for a few examples of which, see below), but for most Indian Buddhist scriptures, even those preserved in Sanskrit, we know little to nothing of how they were actually used in India.

14) I do not overlook the fact that there is a huge body of evidence of the uses of texts in contexts in which they are not understood (in any conventional sense): to take only one type of example, we need only think of the use of Pāli texts by those in Sri Lanka and Southeast Asia who do not know Pāli, of those who use Chinese texts in Korea, Vietnam and Japan but do not know Chinese, and so on. We might also think of inscriptions placed where they cannot be read, or of aids to the recitation of a text by those who are unable even to read—I think here of the so-called *mekura-kyō*, "blind [=illiterate] sūtras," rebus-like aides-mémoire, on which see Watanabe 2012. Into the same category would fall, for instance, the recitation of Chinese texts in Japanese pronunciation by American Buddhists, who know neither language. All the many things one can do with a text which do not require approaching it in terms of "meaning" are fascinating, and certainly in need of extensive study.

15) Ledderose 2004: 395, and Attwood 2019. On the date of Hsüan-tsang's translation see Attwood 2019: 17ff., who doubts that it is a translation at all (I would stress that I have no desire to enter into the debate over whether the *Heart Sūtra* originates in a Chinese composition, discussed by several scholars including Attwood). Jeffrey Kotyk kindly points out to me the references to Hsüan-tsang having presented a gold-lettered *Heart Sūtra* to the throne in 656. See Kotyk 2019: 540.

16) The information in this discussion is taken from Yaita 2001, Kanayama in Takubo and Kanayama 1981: 56–57, and from personal communications with Matsuda Kazunobu (and see Matsuda 2010: 128–129). Regarding the leaf, it is the opinion of Kanayama and Matsuda that the leaf is not palm. There has not yet been, to the best of my knowledge, any examination by a qualified expert in plant biology. A high quality photo is available at www.emuseum.jp.

transcription in Siddham script of a Sanskrit text, perhaps first recorded in Chinese script transcription. There are a number of features of the leaves which support this supposition. Direct examination suggests that the Chinese indication of the title (多心經) found on the first leaf is written in the same ink as the Siddham text (and the same is true for the *Uṣṇīṣavijayā dhāraṇī* with which it is written together, on which see below).[17] If this is correct, it obviously rules out any Indian origin, although it does not help decide whether the leaf was scribed in China or in Japan. Matsuda Kazunobu dates the script to the 9th or 10th century and suggests that it could not have been written by an Indian scribe, a conclusion which corresponds with the evidence of the Chinese abbreviated title. The style of writing seems to treat each akṣara separately, and contains many errors,[18] some of which are highly suggestive, such as the writing of *para*/*ā*- as *pra*-, explicable by the erroneous addition of 二合 after the transcription characters 波羅. While 波羅 easily represents *para*, the 二合 (conventionally added in small characters) is the normal way to indicate that the sounds of two preceding characters should be merged; thus, 波羅二合 would produce *pra*.[19] Simply copying an Indic manuscript would allow almost no way to make such a mistake, that is, if the Vorlage read 𑖦𑖽𑖨. At the same time, there are also other mistakes which do indicate a confusion in reading an Indic script, such as the error of *yuniruddhā* for the correct *aniruddhā*, based on confusion of *yu* for initial *a*.[20] This suggests a two-stage process, involving both a Chinese character transcription and then the copying of an exemplar in an Indic script, perhaps a form of Siddham. A close comparison makes it clear that the text found on the leaves, representing the Short version, which as suggested above might well be based on a Chinese transcription, is not based on that initially credited to Hsüan-tsang but clearly due to Amoghavajra (Pu-k'ung 不空, 705–774), the *T'ang fan fan-tui tzu-yin Po-jo po-lo-mi-to hsin ching* 唐梵飜對字音般若波羅蜜多心經 (T. 256),[21] nor is it identical with the

---

It may be worth noting here that some scholars of late, in arguing for the non-Indic origin of the Heart Sūtra as a whole, have made much of the fact that the so-called Short version, that found on the Hōryūji leaves and in Hsüan-tsang's translation, omits the "normal" opening of a sūtra, *evaṁ mayā śrutam* and so forth. However, see below for the case of the *Uṣṇīṣavijayā*.

17) On this Chinese title see Fukui 1971; 1982; 2000: 25–39, 199–216, esp. 29–30, where the Hōryūji leaves are discussed, although Fukui maintains the notion that these are old. In this context, already Fukui (1971: 153) concluded that this title suggests that the text "was transmitted as a spell (呪文) among Chinese people."

18) For my transcription of the leaf, see Appendix 1, below.

19) Line 7, in the word *prajñā**prā**mitā*. Noted by Yaita 2001: 9.

20) Noted by Yaita 2001: 14n16. As one clear example of the near identity of these letters, see the script table in Marciniak 2017: 109 (*a*) and 110 (*yu*). I do not presume the exact identity of the script which was (mis)copied, and only cite this as an example.

21) See Nagata 1935, esp. 52–58; Wan 2004a, 2004b, 2004c; Chen 2004: 142–151; Fukui 1985, 2000: 91–168, esp. 127–135. On Amoghavajra see Yang 2018. Identified Tun-huang manu-

text transcribed some centuries later by Tz'u-hsien (慈賢, 907–1125? *Maitrībhadra?) and found at Fang-shan (No. 1060), *Fan-pen Po-jo po-lo-mi-to hsin ching* 梵本般若波羅蜜多心經.[22] The ultimate source of the Sanskrit on the Hōryūji leaves is therefore unclear.[23] Both the dating of the Hōryūji leaves and the date of Amoghavajra's transliterated Sanskrit version are significant, since they place the earliest available evidence for the *Sanskrit* text in the 8th century at the earliest.[24] The existence of transcriptions of the complete (Short) *Heart Sūtra* in Chinese script but Sanskrit language is the first good evidence for a different treatment of the text, though this in and of itself does not suggest it was necessarily treated as a *dhāraṇī*.[25]

Before turning to other evidence, we must note that a Tibetan script transcription of the *Heart Sūtra* found at Tun-huang (Pelliot tibétain 448) records Hsüan-tsang's Chinese translation in Tibetan script. That is, in contrast to transcriptions of the Sanskrit sounds in Chinese script, noted above, it transcribes the Chinese sounds in Tibetan script, evidently for the purpose of aiding recitation by those who were not familiar with Chinese writing, but could read the Tibetan script. But this too should not itself necessarily be understood as treating the text as a whole as a *dhāraṇī*. This caution is motivated by the existence of a number of other texts, including not only the *A-mi-t'o ching* 阿彌陀經 but also non-scriptural texts,[26] also transcribed in the

script witnesses: Stein 2464, 3178, 5627, 5648, Pelliot 2322.16, Peking University 118. To the best of my knowledge, the Chinese transcriptions have not yet been strictly evaluated by those who have reconstructed the underlying Sanskrit, because case endings, for instance, and vowel length are often not indicated, at least not consistently, in such transcriptions. This could be important because Siddham script versions often indeed contain errors precisely in case endings (often missing) and vowel length.

22) Fukui 1989, 2000: 441–459. Tz'u-hsien is also responsible for a commentary, *Hsia chu po-lo-mi-to hsin ching* 挾註波羅蜜多心經 (T. 2747), based on Stein 2421 (complete), but see also 5771 (partial), not used by the Taishō editors.

23) The same is true for the accompanying *Uṣṇīṣavijayā dhāraṇī*, on which see below.

24) As above (n. 15), avoiding the debate over the origins of the *Heart Sūtra*, I do note that this late appearance of Sanskrit evidence is of potential relevance for this discussion. I also note that this date causes no conflicts with the dates of the Indian commentators of the text, the earliest of whom is perhaps the late 8th-century Kamalaśīla.

25) Jeffrey Kotyk kindly brings to my attention the mention already in the *K'ai-yüan shih-chiao lu* 開元釋教錄 of 730 of the attribution of a *Heart Sūtra* translation to Kumārajīva, which it calls *Ta ming-chou ching* 大明呪經, "Great Spell Sūtra" (T. 2154 [LV] 512b13, 555c3, 569c12, 584a7, 666c6, 680c18, 701b21); the text itself, attributed to Kumārajīva, is T. 250.

26) If I may permit myself a slight autobiographical aside: during my first stay in Japan, I noticed that, morning and evening, the elderly father of the family from whom I rented a room recited the *Amida-kyō* before the *butsudan*, the Buddhist altar. Having a recent interest in Buddhism, and this text in particular, I thought it might be interesting to read it with him. I immediately discovered, however, that he had not a clue about the Chinese in which the text was composed, no idea of syntax or grammar (and no interest therein). For him, manifestly the *Amida-kyō* in its Japanese pronunciation of the Chinese characters functioned precisely as does a *dhāraṇī*. This seems to be much more the rule than the exception, at least in modern Japan.

same manner, namely using Tibetan script to convey Chinese sounds.[27] The purpose of such transcripts seems to have been at least in part as a base for (cultic) recitation, a topic which requires a separate discussion.[28] However, a different evaluation may be given to the *Chinese* transcriptions of the *Sanskrit* text of the *Heart Sūtra*, attributed to Amoghavajra and Tz'u-hsien, respectively, the former of which existed already in the 8th century. Several other such transcriptions of *dhāraṇī*s are also attributed to both Amoghavajra and Tz'u-hsien, that is, transcriptions of Sanskrit *dhāraṇī* texts in Chinese characters,[29] but what is important is that these are all transcriptions of a *dhāraṇī* alone, either apart or as embedded within a larger text, which is itself translated into Chinese. So far as I know, the *Heart Sūtra* is one of only two sūtras transcribed *in toto* in Sanskrit form using Chinese characters, which could be suggestive of the idea that the text as a whole was treated as a *dhāraṇī*.[30]

Now, although it is often left unremarked in discussions of the *Heart Sūtra*, the *Heart Sūtra* is not alone on the two Hōryūji leaves, but inscribed alongside another text, namely the *Uṣṇīṣavijayā dhāraṇī*.[31] It seems most likely that this *Uṣṇīṣavijayā dhāraṇī* too was, directly or indirectly, retranscribed from a Chinese transcription,[32] and as with the *Heart Sūtra*, the leaf also contains a Chinese abbreviated title,

27) See Takata 1988: 32–33, 291–292.

28) In some cases such transcription also apparently served to allow the memorization of texts required for examinations for admission to the monastic community (an insight I owe to Takata), again a topic which requires separate consideration. In this case, the idea was that those who could not read the Chinese script would nevertheless be enabled to memorize texts written in Chinese, a requirement for ordination. A transcription in Chinese characters of a text in Sanskrit would obviously not be helpful to someone illiterate in Chinese.

29) On Tz'u-hsien's transcriptions, see the phonological study of Lin 2014. Quite understandably, the majority of scholarly attention paid these transcriptions has come from specialists in Chinese historical phonology.

30) I owe to the kindness of my friend Paul Harrison the reminder that another example of a complete transcription in Chinese characters is found in several copies of the *Vajracchedikā Prajñāpāramitā* preserved in Japan, all ultimately based on a copy sent to Japan from China by Ennin 圓仁 (792–862), discussed in Harrison 2010, esp. 207, 212. This text pairs the complete Chinese script transcription of the Sanskrit (and Chinese glosses of Sanskrit words) with the Sanskrit text in Siddham script. See plates 3 and 4 in Okukaze 2010. I do not speculate here on the question whether, if my hypothesis has any merit, interesting questions then might be asked of the *Vajracchedikā* materials.

31) At the last moment, through the kindness of the author I received a copy of Sasaki 2015. I am most gratified to see that in our considerations of evidence and earlier scholarship, and in our thinking overall, we agree almost entirely (although naturally a bit disappointed to learn that I have therefore said even less new here than I had imagined!). It is a pity that so much scholarship on the *Uṣṇīṣavijayā dhāraṇī*, probably due to unfamiliarity with the Japanese language, has overlooked Sasaki's studies.

32) See already Hikata 1939: 40.

Fo-ting 仏頂, signifying *Buddhoṣṇīṣa*.[33] And once again, Chinese-script transliterations of the Sanskrit *Uṣṇīṣavijayā dhāraṇī* were also available, again due to Amoghavajra (and later Tz'u-hsien),[34] but again at least as far as that of Amoghavajra is concerned, in a form that does not agree completely with the text on the Hōryūji leaf (and note, importantly, that the leaf has only the *dhāraṇī* and not the *Uṣṇīṣavijayā* scripture as such).[35] According to Sasaki, the Hōryūji text agrees most closely with the oldest and simplest version of the *dhāraṇī*, which is found in Chinese versions dating from 679 to 710, as well as the version in the sole extant Sanskrit manuscript of the entire text (on which see below), though it does not agree completely with any known source.[36]

I cannot suggest a good reason why these two texts, the *Heart Sūtra* and the *Uṣṇīṣavijayā dhāraṇī*, were written together on the Hōryūji leaves. Unless and until it can be known where and when the leaves were actually inscribed, it will be difficult to move forward on this question directly. But these leaves are far from the only close association between these two particular texts, and we can at the very least establish that this pairing is not at all unique. Furthermore, looking more broadly at a few other works usually classified as *dhāraṇī* sūtras, we may briefly explore a small aspect of the dimensions of this genre. In addition to the *Uṣṇīṣavijayā dhāraṇī*, the other texts we can consider here are the *Mahāpratisarā* and the so-called *Precious Casket* (on the Sanskrit title of which, see below).[37]

---

33) It is not devoid of interest that the character is clearly 仏, best known as a Japanese abbreviated form, but old in China. Kiattisak Ponampon 2018: 19, 22–23, notes this use in his study of the Tun-huang manuscript Stein 2585, which although titled *Fo-shuo kuan ching* 佛說觀經 is not in fact a sūtra. According to Galambos 2010: 7n9, "仏, a non-standard form of the character 佛 (Buddha)…coinciding with the modern Japanese way of writing the same character, was never used in sutras, only in non-canonical Buddhist texts." Is this further evidence that the manuscript was in fact written in Japan?

34) See Yuyama 1997.

35) This situation in fact led Watanabe 2009: 54 to write cautiously and, if the Hōryūji manuscript was really written in China, then with much justification, "In this way, the chances are high that the Hōryūji manuscript was written in Tang China, in a period when *dhāraṇī* faith flourished. Thus, we can hold that at this period in China the *Heart Sūtra* was considered as an example of a *dhāraṇī* scripture." For the *Heart Sūtra*'s similar acceptance in Japan, see Watanabe 2009: 315. For the *Uṣṇīṣavijayā dhāraṇī* in three versions, see Hikata 1939: 38–40. According to Sasaki 2015: 196, in comparison to the *Heart Sūtra* written on the same leaves, the text of the *Uṣṇīṣavijayā dhāraṇī* has fewer errors.

36) Sasaki 2015: 197 points to T. 967, 968, 969, 970, 971, 974E, 1803. See his discussion for details of the differences he has detected.

37) When I originally presented this paper at the 64th International Conference of Eastern Studies (Tōhō Gakkai 東方學會) in Tokyo on May 18, 2019, I also offered a few considerations of the *Aparimitāyurjñāna*. However, in the interests of space, and since I am completing a larger-scale study of this work I began more than twenty years ago, I refrain from addressing it here.

As noted above, the *Uṣṇīṣavijayā dhāraṇī* appeared in T'ang China in Chinese transcription of Sanskrit. Although quite some centuries later, the *dhāraṇī* is famously inscribed on the Chü-yung-kuan 居庸關, the 14th-century arch outside Beijing carefully studied by a team from Kyoto University, where it appears in six scripts: Lantsa, Tibetan, Tangut, 'Phags pa, Uigur and Chinese (all of these transcribing the Sanskrit sounds). The same text appears on a nearly contemporary bell in what is now North Korea at the Yŏnboksa 演福寺, again in multiple scripts.[38] The dedication and quite considerable economic resources required to produce both of these projects speak eloquently of the value placed on this *dhāraṇī*, something confirmed by the fact that it is found so very broadly across the Buddhist world.

The *Uṣṇīṣavijayā dhāraṇī* has been subject to a great deal of scholarly attention,[39] and here it is possible only to touch on some of the more interesting results, which demonstrate the extremely wide spread of this text throughout Asia.[40] The text appears in multiple versions in Chinese and Tibetan.[41] Its distribution on inscriptions is impressive: it appears to have been especially popular in Yün-nan, where it appears on multiple gravestones in Sanskrit inscribed in Siddham script.[42] Perhaps most importantly in the present context, the text itself speaks of the way it is to be treated, and we learn from archaeology that these instructions were followed closely. (Some of) the ways the *Heart Sūtra* was treated suggest that it too was seen as falling under the guidelines found in other texts, such as the *Uṣṇīṣavijayā dhāraṇī*. And this borrowing was necessitated because the *Heart Sūtra* itself offers no guidance.

One important difference between the *Heart Sūtra* and (other) *dhāraṇī* texts is that it is entirely *non-self-referential*. That is to say, we know that people did all sorts of things with the *Heart Sūtra*, but whatever reasons they had to do all of these things, it was not because the text itself told them to do it. This stands in contrast to the cases of the other *dhāraṇī* texts we are concerned with. Of course, some of the things one is encouraged to do, such as to chant or recite a text, leave no traces that we can,

38) For the former Murata and Fujieda 1955–1957, for the latter, Yuyama 1985, 1989; Suematsu 1985.

39) There is no point in offering a catalogue here. We might simply mention Hikata 1939; Mak 2020; Sasaki 2007, 2008, 2015, 2019, 2020. The immensely complicated matter of the attribution of several of the Chinese translations is addressed by Forte Unpublished.

40) Among other things, which indicate its even modern-day relevance, it is recited weekly along with six others in Nepal as part of the Saptavāra or 'seven days' practice, in which a specific *dhāraṇī* is assigned to each day of the week. See Bühnemann 2014.

41) The popular Chinese version is that attributed to Buddhapālita, on which see inter alia Forte Unpublished. On the Chinese versions see Sasaki 2005.

42) Among a substantial number of studies, see for instance Liebenthal 1947, 1955; von Hinüber 1989; Mak 2020; Howard 1997.

at a historical remove, verify (save secondarily, for instance if there is mention of such practice in other sources). But some texts offer instructions which produce more materially detectable results, and it is precisely the result of obedience to these instructions that we are able to see on the ground.

The larger sūtra which contains the *Uṣṇīṣavijayā dhāraṇī* itself promises a variety of boons, very similar to what the other texts to be discussed also offer. Although the sūtra has long been available in Chinese and Tibetan,[43] not long ago a mostly intact Sanskrit manuscript version was found, which is currently in the Miho museum (having been conserved in the meanwhile), first identified and edited, but not published, by Gregory Schopen, then presented in a limited distribution report by Gudrun Meltzer, and finally published by the late Unebe Toshiya.[44] According to this version, which closely agrees with the Chinese and Tibetan, though not completely (something not always clear from Unebe's translation), the text will free one from a wide variety of ills, most taking place after death, but interestingly the text also claims to be able to free one of present illness.[45] Mere recitation of the text assures positive post-mortem results, that is, excellent rebirths free from all forms of suffering, and rebirth in Sukhāvatī, a common claim for such texts.[46] Something of the theology of the text is indicated by the promise that reciting it 21 times will assure *mahānirvāṇa*, an expression of very uncertain meaning, but whatever it does mean, it seems not to be a permanent state, since the text goes on to discuss what one will do, apparently, after that attainment.[47]

As mentioned above, the Hōryūji leaves are not the only place that the *Heart Sūtra* and the *Uṣṇīṣavijayā dhāraṇī* appear together. They also appear inscribed together on so-called *dhāraṇī* pillars, *ching-ch'uang* 經幢, or, apparently more usually, *shih-ch'uang* 石幢.[48] The *Uṣṇīṣavijayā* states that one should place the

43) The Tibetan translation was rendered into Japanese by Sasaki 2019, 2020.

44) I have an undated (but probably mid-2000s) photocopy of Schopen's handwritten draft edition, translation and annotations. For the others, see Meltzer 2007 and Unebe 2015. Schopen may have worked directly from the manuscript, which may have enabled him in some cases to read slightly more of the text than has been read by its subsequent editors, but I have not systematically compared the transcriptions. As his work remains unpublished, I refrain from citing it here, while hoping for its speedy publication.

45) Unebe 2015: §3, 9.1, 9.2.

46) §9.3. See Schopen 1977.

47) §9.3. And of course this stipulation that the *dhāraṇī* be recited 21 times, found in several places in the text with or without a set of ritual instructions, is directly related to the request in 775 of the disciples of Amoghavajra that "the imperial court order monks and nuns in the entire empire to memorize and recite twenty-one times a day this *Foding zunsheng tuoluo ni*." Kuo 2014: 361.

48) Kuo 2014: 361. It is worth observing that *ch'uang* strictly speaking would most normally be interpreted as a banner, rather than the pillar upon which this banner might be hung. I follow however the conventional translation of the term in the specialist literature.

dhāraṇī atop a pole or in a variety of other high places,[49] and anyone seeing it, merely passing through the shadow it casts, or being touched with dust blown off it, should know that they will be freed of unfortunate rebirth and be reborn in Sukhāvatī.[50] Throughout China we find a number of such *dhāraṇī* pillars, more than 300 of which are datable to the period from 697 to 1285, and more than 90% of which are inscribed with the *Uṣṇīṣavijayā dhāraṇī*.[51] Examples from before the year 731 contain the full text of the *Uṣṇīṣavijayā dhāraṇī* (that is, the *Fo-ting tsun-sheng t'o-lo-ni ching* 佛頂尊勝陀羅尼經), often alongside the *Heart Sūtra*.[52] One example dates to 702, during the reign of Wu Tse-t'ien 武則天.[53] To the best of my knowledge, when the *Heart Sūtra* is inscribed on such pillars, it is always in Chinese translation, not in Siddham script or in Chinese transcription of a Sanskrit text. However, that this was not the only available pattern is clear from the so-called Long Roll of Buddhist Images (or *Ta-li-kuo fan-hsiang chüan* 大理國梵像卷) by the painter Chang Sheng-wen 張勝溫, dating to between 1172–1176.[54] There we find depictions of two *dhāraṇī* pillars (called *pao-ch'uang* 寶幢, precious pillars) with inscriptions in Siddham script and Sanskrit language, one of which is the *Heart Sūtra*, so labeled in Chinese (*to-hsin pao-ch'uang* 多心寶幢).[55] This demonstrates that in the 12th century

49) The term for pole is typically *dhvaja* (again, like the Chinese [see the previous note], more usually flag or banner), understood as pillar. See among many examples Hidas 2012: 25–26n3, and in the text §27, 223n183 (referring to the *Ratnaketuparivarta*). See also Giunta 2008.

50) The importance of the shadow deserves to be studied. Note that the *Mānavadharmaśāstra* (IV.130) warns against treading on the shadow of a deity (*devatā*, thus, an image), one's master and so on. The idea that even the shadow holds some power is clearly of a piece with the notion expressed in the sūtra.

51) According to Kuo 2006: 38n4, however, including undated pillars there are probably closer to 700. There were many more before the suppression of Buddhism in 844, which saw the wide-scale destruction of such pillars, as reported by the Japanese pilgrim Ennin 圓仁; see Kuo 2014: 354–355. On pillars, see also Sasaki 2008. For a map of the distribution of pillars, see Kuo 2014: 353.

52) Kuo 2014: 356, and 365.

53) Kuo 2014: 376n47 refers to Lu Tseng-hsiang 陸增祥, *Pa-ch'iung-shih chin-shih pu-cheng* 八瓊室金石補正, *chüan* 46, folio 1a (see https://ctext.org/library.pl?if=gb&file=29112&page=2), on which is found the reference that the *Heart Sūtra* was inscribed alongside the *Uṣṇīṣavijayā*. See also Shen T'ao 沈濤, *Ch'ang-shan chen-shih-chih* 常山貞石志, *chüan* 7, folio 2a (https://ctext.org/library.pl?if=gb&file=31551&page=4).

54) For the date see Li 2005; but note that already Chapin 1970: 166 had given 1173–1176.

55) For a transcription, see Appendix 2, below. See Soper in Chapin 1971: 133, and plate 129. Although there are better color plates available, the black and white plate here is quite legible. Soper misread the character which is evidently *pao* 寶 as *ching* 經. While *ching* is contextually possible, it is nevertheless evidently *pao*, with the central element of the character standing for the whole (this confirmed by an image found at http://www.chise.org/est/view/character/repi.hng-gok=972. I thank Rafal Felbur for discussion on this point). The bases in the images make it clear that pillars, rather than hanging banners, are intended here. The other pillar is labeled *Hu-kuo pao-*

in the area of Ta-li, in Yün-nan, the region in which are found so many Siddham Sanskrit stone inscriptions of the *Uṣṇīṣavijayā dhāraṇī*, it was not anomalous to consider the Sanskrit *Heart Sūtra* worthy of inscription on a *dhāraṇī* pillar. That this association, moreover, was not at all limited to the southwest is demonstrated by the so-called Northern Pagoda of Ch'ao-yang 朝陽北塔, located in Liao-ning 遼寧 Province, north of Beijing, almost as far away from Yün-nan as one can get in China. This structure, which dates back to the Sui dynasty, was reconstructed in the Liao in 1043–1044.[56] It includes a monumental *dhāraṇī* pillar, on which, in addition to other *dhāraṇī*s, are the *Uṣṇīṣavijayā dhāraṇī* and the *Heart Sūtra*.[57] These are far from the only examples.[58]

One fact about the Short *Heart Sūtra* which has time and again drawn attention is the way it begins *in medias res*, without the standard stock opening of a sūtra, *evaṁ mayā śrutam* and so on, and that it ends without the stock close. It is thus worthy of notice that the so far uniquely known Sanskrit manuscript of the complete sūtra of the *Uṣṇīṣavijayā dhāraṇī* similarly lacks the stock opening and close.[59] Among other

---

ch'uang 護國寶幢. Citing Chinese scholars, Mak 2020: 248n4 identifies its contents as "A combination of four *dhāraṇī*s including: i) "*Renwang-huguo*" [*Vairocana-*]*prajñāpāramitā-dhāraṇī* 仁王護國般若波羅蜜多經咒; ii) *Mimi dazhangju* 祕密大章句 (T312); iii) Forty-two-lettered *Arapacana*; iv) *Cintāmaṇidhāraṇī* 如意寶珠陀羅尼 (T1402)."

56) The date 1043–1044 given by Kim 2013: 117 for the "upper relic crypt" also applies to the space where the *dhāraṇī* inscriptions are found, which is the substructure (*ti-kung* 地宮) of the pagoda. See also Kuo 2014: 363.

57) According to Fujiwara 2011: 201, in addition to the *Heart Sūtra* the *dhāraṇī*s on the pillar are: 大佛頂如來放光悉但多鉢怛羅陀羅尼經 (*Sitātapatradhāraṇī*), 大隨求陀羅尼經 (*Mahāpratisarā-dhāraṇī*), 聖千手千眼觀自在菩薩摩訶薩廣大圓滿無礙大悲心陀羅尼, 佛說金剛大摧碎延壽陀羅尼經, 大乘百字密語, 佛頂尊勝陀羅尼經 (*Uṣṇīṣavijayā*), 唐梵對翻菩提場莊嚴陀羅尼 (*Bodhimaṇḍālaṁkāra*), and 大輪陀羅尼. The pillar is illustrated in Waugh 2011: 61. Largely illegible photos are found in Tung and Chang 1992: 19–20 (pl. 43–48). It is however possible to see on pl. 47 that the *Uṣṇīṣavijayā dhāraṇī* is written in both Chinese and Siddham. That is probably not the case for the others, although pl. 46 with the 佛說金剛大摧碎延壽陀羅尼經 is absolutely illegible. The *Heart Sūtra* on pl. 45 is also almost illegible, but I see no Siddham in what is visible.

58) Kuo 2014: 364 recounts the erection in 812 of two pillars with the *Uṣṇīṣavijayā*. Though they were damaged in the Hui-ch'ang 會昌 persecution of 844, the family maintained the pillars long afterwards, "even adding a new inscription of the *Duoxinjing* 多心經 (Heart sūtra)." Kuo relates on the same page another account of a burial inscription of 987, again with the *Uṣṇīṣavijayā* and the *Heart Sūtra*.

59) Although it is not as clear as it might be in Unebe's 2015 edition, this feature of the manuscript is pointed out by Schopen in his unpublished edition. Unebe 2015: 106 writes: "This paragraph [referring to the opening sequence, which he places between brackets—JAS] does not exist in the Miho Museum Sanskrit manuscript. The chances are low that it existed in the original Sanskrit text, but it is the opening stock phrase and we can presume, from the Mahāyāna sūtras cited below [omitted here—JAS], that almost all corresponding Sanskrit texts were in the form shown above" (この節は Miho Museum 所藏サンスクリット寫本 (Ms.) には存在しない。梵本原典に存在していた可能性は低いが、經典冒頭の定型的フレーズであり、下に示す大乘經典等から相當する梵文

things, then, this omission of the "stock opening" cannot be used to support the idea that a text is not authentically Indian, as some have tried to argue in relation to the *Heart Sūtra*. But what may be even more interesting in the present context is that given the close relation between the *Heart Sūtra* and the *Uṣṇīṣavijayā*, it is not beyond the realm of imagination that the Hōryūji Sanskrit text of the *Heart Sūtra*, which I argue treats the text *in toto* as a *dhāraṇī*, is not the only such case. On the Hōryūji leaf to be sure we do not have the extensive *Uṣṇīṣavijayā* sūtra, but might it be possible to imagine that, despite its length, the Miho Museum manuscript was understood to (re)present the *Uṣṇīṣavijayā* sūtra as a whole as a (sort of) *dhāraṇī*?

The *Uṣṇīṣavijayā* is not the only text which offers similar guidance for its application and use, and we may note some other evidence that the ways that the *Heart Sūtra* was treated need not correspond directly to the stipulations in the *Uṣṇīṣavijayā*. The *Mahāpratisarā* was little noticed by scholars until recently, but extremely influential, again, throughout historical Buddhist Asia, and in recent years, fittingly, has been the object of considerable attention.[60] It shares a number of features with the *Uṣṇīṣavijayā dhāraṇī*, including the fact that both *dhāraṇī*s are deified, that is, there is for each text an associated goddess, figures of which are widely attested.[61] Like the *Uṣṇīṣavijayā dhāraṇī*, the *Mahāpratisarā* recommends fixing it to a flagpole, which seems, as above, to have been understood primarily to indicate that it be inscribed on *dhāraṇī* pillars. Perhaps the most common, and indeed widely attested, practice is however writing the *Mahāpratisarā* as an amulet, and a great many such amulet texts have been found. Some of these are explicitly associated with death and burials. The text seems to have been particularly associated with safe childbirth, and frequently used in that context.[62] It is found throughout the Buddhist world, from

---

ほぼ全てを上のような形で推定できる). I disagree with him on this last point. Unebe has further valuable comments about the leaf on the same page, which we need not go into here.

60) There is no need for a complete bibliography here, but see especially Hidas 2012; Cruijsen, Griffiths and Klokke 2013. Note that this is yet another text translated by Amoghavajra.

61) The same is broadly true for Prajñāpāramitā, a goddess, but I do not know that she is particularly associated with the *Heart Sūtra*, and thus leave her aside here. On Mahāpratisarā see Kimura 2018, on Uṣṇīṣavijayā Lokesh Chandra 1980.

62) Cruijsen, Griffiths and Klokke 2013: 76–77. After making the case that the text was apparently originally two separate units, speaking of the first (core) portion, the authors say: "the Buddha describing the benefits that may be obtained through the use of the *Mahāpratisarā-dhāraṇī*, the common denominator of which is either protection from all bad things (e.g. diseases, demons, the results of bad karma) or the fulfillment of any worldly wishes (e.g. prosperity, good rebirth, obtaining a son)." Note further p. 81: "it might be that the *Mahāpratisarādhāraṇī*, due to its primary use as an amulet, was not worshipped in the same way as other *dhāraṇī*s [at Dunhuang]. In China, however, the *Mahāpratisarādhāraṇī* certainly did come to be used for inscription on so-called '*dhāraṇī* pillars' in stone, a practice wide-spread in East Asia for which initially the *Uṣṇīṣavijayadhāraṇī* appears to have been predominantly used, and which probably

Gilgit to Indonesia and even, most remarkably perhaps, in the Philippines.[63] All sorts of protections are offered by the text in promotion of itself, and the prevalence of copies of the text, again usually in amulet form, demonstrates that its self-promoting suggestions were taken very seriously. The text further offers those who deploy it an extended lifespan, again, a promise not unique to this *dhāraṇī*.[64] We should note in this context that the *Heart Sūtra* is often deployed in amulet form, though I do not know how old this practice is, or whether it was traditionally placed in amulets in Sanskrit form.

The last work we will consider here, perhaps better known under its Japanese pronunciation as *Hōkyōin-kyō* 寶篋印經 (sometimes translated *Treasure Casket Seal*, which I will use below for convenience), has, as such texts sometimes do, a rather forbidding Sanskrit title, *Āryasarvatathāgatādhiṣṭhānahṛdayaguhyadhātukaraṇḍa-mudrā*.[65] This text, like others, advocates that in order to obtain its merits devotees copy it and place it in a caitya or stūpa, and this was very frequently done throughout the Buddhist world. Like the *Uṣṇīṣavijayā*, it is to be recited 21 times. The text has been found inscribed in Sri Lanka,[66] in Udayagiri in Orissa,[67] and throughout East Asia, where, like other texts we notice here, it was translated by Amoghavajra (T. 1022).[68] Perhaps most famously, it was printed and placed within, sources report, 84,000 stūpas by the late 10th-century king of the Wu-yüeh 吳越, Ch'ien Ch'u 錢俶 (929–988), sometimes placed within hollow bricks.[69] Many of these small stūpas were brought to Japan, and the *dhāraṇī* was widely transmitted there. The distinctive *Hōkyōin-tō* 寶篋印塔 or Precious Casket stūpas dot the Japanese countryside, although it is unlikely that many recognize their significance any longer. Quite interestingly, the Shingon monk Eison 叡尊 (1201–1290) reports that in a sculpture of the bodhisattva Mañjuśrī in the Hannyaji 般若寺 temple, located in Nara, destroyed by fire in 1490, were placed a large number of texts, including 1000 copies of the

---

has its origin in the establishment of flagpoles made of perishable materials, as described in the [*Mahāpratisarāmahāvidyārājñī*], as well as in other *dhāraṇīsūtra*s."

63) Orlina 2013.

64) For the functions of this *dhāraṇī*, though of course not limited to it alone, see Hidas 2013: 230–231.

65) See the materials and essays in Kokusai Bukkyōgaku Daigakuin Daigaku Nihon Koshakyō Kenkyūjo Monkashō Senryaku Purojekuto Jikkō Iinkai 2013; Rosenfeld 2014. A complete translation from Tibetan is found in Goshima 2013, 2014, 2015, 2018, 2019.

66) Schopen 1982.

67) Tanaka 2016.

68) Baba 2012=2016=2017 (the last an English version of the first two, themselves published separately but identical!) suggests that this sūtra was brought to China by Amoghavajra from Sri Lanka. See however Cruijsen, Griffiths and Klokke 2013: 123, 127n173.

69) Hattori 2010; Shen 2012.

Heart Sūtra in Sanskrit and 1000 of the *Treasure Casket Seal Dhāraṇī*, in addition to a number of other texts. Given the presence of other texts including the 600-*chüan* Large *Prajñāpāramitā*, the *Lotus Sūtra*, and so on, however, this cannot be strictly seen as a ritual convergence of these two texts specifically. It should be noted, however, that the *Heart Sūtra* and the *Treasure Casket Seal Dhāraṇī* (and thus, I understand, not the sūtra *in extenso*) are the only two *dhāraṇī* or *dhāraṇī*-like texts included in the deposit.[70)]

Where do these brief considerations lead us? These three *dhāraṇī* texts—that is, with the exception of the *Heart Sūtra*—give instructions on how one should treat them, what one should do with the text itself to propagate it, and what one has to do to gain access to the benefits that the text itself promises. The text makes a promise, but in doing so of course it merely records the words of the Buddha. The promise is made by the Buddha, who preached the text; if one does something with the text, or with its *dhāraṇī*, which obviously represents the text as a whole, then, the Buddha tells his audience—and through the sūtra tells every audience who hears or reads the text—what wonderful benefits will certainly result. For the tradition, the texts are direct records of the very words of the Buddha, and in his preaching the Buddha made explicit the logic connecting practice and cult with future benefit.

But the case of the *Heart Sūtra* seems different in almost every way. The text is not preached by the Buddha. The text does not advocate any practice. The text does not offer any benefit. And yet, we know that people often did treat the text of the *Heart Sūtra* in some of the same ways that they treated the texts of some *dhāraṇī* sūtras. Why?

The obvious conclusion is that, with the *Heart Sūtra* itself offering no instructions on how it is to be treated, individuals familiar with the similar *dhāraṇī* literature recognized the *Heart Sūtra* (also) as a *dhāraṇī*(-type?) sūtra and subsequently generalized from what those texts say about themselves and how they are to be treated, and applied (some of) those same practices to the *Heart Sūtra* in its turn. In other words, once having recognized that the *Heart Sūtra* not only *contains* a *dhāraṇī*, but *is* a *dhāraṇī*, those familiar with other texts belonging to the same category made the assumption that the *Heart Sūtra* should be treated in the same way (and, we should probably also expect, would provide the same benefits) as those other—in some vital respects comparable—scriptures.

It is self-evident that the reasons for the modern popularity of the text are not necessarily, or not even at all, the same as those which prevailed in the historical past. At least one factor is that, as in other cases, the influence of Japanese

70) Quinter 2007a: 459; 2007b: 469; 2015: 97, 276, 287; Wu 2014: 78.

sectarianism must be reckoned with here. At least part of the modern scholarly concern with these texts, and in the case of the *Heart Sūtra* also its popular appeal outside of Japan, may be traced to Japanese (sectarian) influences on modern Buddhist Studies in its formative years, and to modern Western Buddhist practices. It is no accident that F. Max Müller, who edited and translated both the *Heart Sūtra* and *Uṣṇīṣavijayā dhāraṇī*,[71] did so under the influential guidance of Nanjō Bun'yū 南條文雄 (1849–1927), and the fact that American Buddhists chant the *Heart Sūtra*, reading in roman script a transcription of the Japanese pronunciation of the Chinese translation-cum-transcription of the text, including its *mantra*, which itself is then chanted in Japanese pronunciation of its Chinese transcription of Sanskrit (adding yet another layer), is a direct result of the central place this short text holds in Japanese Buddhist traditions, above all in the Zen traditions which have been so very influential.

This logic also goes some way toward explaining why Müller's edition of the *Uṣṇīṣavijayā dhāraṇī* did not have the same impact as did his edition of the *Heart Sūtra*. It is true that he, as is often quoted, referred in this publication of 1884 to the *Uṣṇīṣavijayā* saying that *dhāraṇī*s "[mark] the lowest degradation of one of the most perfect religions, at least as conceived originally in the mind of its founder. Here [in the *Uṣṇīṣavijayā dhāraṇī*] we have in mere gibberish a prayer for a long life,"[72] and this is not a sentiment likely to encourage serious scholarly engagement. But I think that this is not the (sole) reason for the history of scholarly and popular comparative neglect. The chief responsibility for this seems to me to lie elsewhere, namely in the fact that unlike the *Heart Sūtra*, the *Uṣṇīṣavijayā dhāraṇī* has had no vocal advocates among modern practitioners. This is true in Japan, in the first place, and when tantric traditions began, chiefly under the influence of Tibetan Buddhism, to make their way West, as remains the case now, the practices to which Western Buddhists were exposed were not centrally those of the *kriyā tantra*s at all. Lacking advocates, texts like the *Uṣṇīṣavijayā dhāraṇī*, despite their historical prominence, fell out of view.[73]

To conclude, I fear that nothing that has been said here is new. Nor does this essay overturn dogma, scholarly or otherwise. But it might offer, at least to those who do

71) And, it is worth mentioning, the *Sukhāvatīvyūha* sūtras, of little demonstrable significance in India but hugely important in Japan.

72) Müller 1884: 31.

73) This suggestion with regard to marginality could be challenged, for instance, by the existence of a group like the Foundation for the Preservation of the Mahayana Tradition (FPMT), some followers of which, for instance, have great interest in the *Saṁghāṭasūtra*, a text once extremely popular but which had (until recently) no modern following. The practices and trends of modern Western Buddhism, however, lie far outside my expertise.

not read Japanese scholarship, some small hints toward another way to think about a familiar text. And perhaps that will have to suffice.

Appendix 1

The Hōryūji text of the *Heart Sūtra*, transcribed from good color photographs of the leaves. Line numbers are inserted in brackets.[74)]

[1] namas sarvajñāya āryāvalokiteśvarabodhisatvo gambhīraṁ prajñāpāramitāyaṁ caryāṁ caramāno vyavalokayati sma paṁca skandhās tāś ca svabhāvaśūnyaṁ paśya[2]ti sma iha śāriputra rūpaṁ śūnyatā śūnyataiva rūpaṁ rūpān na pṛthak* śūnyatā śūnyatāyā na pṛthag rūpaṁ yad rūpaṁ sā śūnyatā yā śūnyatā tad rūpaṁ evam eva veda[3]nāsaṁjñāsaṁskāra-vijñānāni iha śāriputra sarvadharmā śūnyatālakṣaṇā anutpannā yunirūddhā amalā vimalānonā na paripūrṇaṁ tasmāc chāriputra śūnyatā[4]yāṁ na rūpaṁ na vedanā saṁjñā na saṁskārā na vijñāni na cakṣaśrotraghrāṇajihvākāyamanāṁsi na rūpaṁ śabdagandharasaspraṣṭavyadharmā na cakṣurdhātu yāvat ta ma[5]nodhātu na vidyā nāvidyā na vidyākṣayo nāvidyākṣayo yāvan na jarāmaraṇaṁ na jarāmaraṇakṣayo na duḥkhasamudayanirodhamārga na jñānaṁ na prāptitvaṁ bodhisatvasya prajñāpārami[6]tām āśṛtyaṁ viharati cittavaraṇaḥ cittāvaraṇanāstitvād atrasto viparyasātikrantaḥ niṣṭanirvāṇaḥ tryadhvavyavasthitā sarvabuddhāḥ prajñāpāramitām āśutyānuttarāṁ samyaksaṁbodhim abhi[7]saṁbuddhā tasmā jñātavyaṁ prajñāprāmitā mahāmaṁtro mahāvidyāmaṁtraḥ anuttaramaṁtra asa[b1]masamamaṁtra sarvaduḥkha-praśamanaḥ satyam amityathvāk* prajñāpāramitāyām ukto maṁtraḥ tadyathā gate gate pāragate pārasaṁgate bodhi svāhā ||:|| prajñāpāramitahṛdyā samaptā

Appendix 2

A transcription of the Sanskrit text of the *Heart Sūtra* inscribed in Siddham script on Chang Sheng-wen's 張勝溫 Long Roll of Buddhist Images (*Ta-li-kuo fan-hsiang chüan* 大理國梵像卷).[75)]

---

74) See above n. 16. I know of akṣara by akṣara transcriptions by Radim Navyan (https://www.academia.edu/40141271/Heart_Sutra_H%C5%8Dry%C5%AB_ji_MS_transcription_and_analysis) and Jayarava (https://www.academia.edu/2257954/Horiuzi_Palm_leaf_Manuscript_Heart_Sutra), but both (especially the latter) are sometimes inaccurate. My transcription indicates a *virama* with *. Several things remain unclear to me despite the kind help of Peter Szanto: end of l. 4: *yāvat ta*? *yāvanta*? l. 6 *āśutyā*°? I don't see how we could read the expected *āśṛtyā*. b1: I read *amithyatvāk**, but surely *amityathvāt** was intended.

75) See above n. 54. I learned from Mak 2020 248n4 of Lin 2006. Thanks to the kindness of Eric Greene, I obtained a scan of the page range mentioned by Mak, namely pp. 225–270, and found on pp. 262–267 a transcription of the text. Lin claims to be able somehow, if I understand him (262n2) correctly, to read *prajñāpāramitāhṛdayasūttaṁ* before the word *ārya*, but in all

āryā[2]valokitesvaro bodhisatvo gambhīrā pra[3]jñāpāramitāyāṁ caramāṇyā vyavalokā[4]yati sma pañca skāṁddhās tṛāṁs ca svabhāvasunyaṁ pa[5]syati sma ihā sariputrā rūpāṁ sunyateva rū[6]paṁ rūpaṁ na pṛthā sunyatā sunyatāyāṁ na pṛ[7]thāks rūṁpaṁ yad rūpaṁ sa sunyatā ya sunyatā sa [8] rūpaṁ evamm eva vedanasaṁjñānasaṁskāra | [9] vijñānāṁ ihā sariputrā sarvadharmā so[10]nyatālakṣāṇā anutpanna anirūddhā a[11]mala avimala anugatā aparpūrṇñā [12] tasmac chāripūtrā sunyatāyāṁ na rūpaṁ na ve[13]danā na saṁjñā na saṁskārā na vijñānāṁ na ca[14]kṣusrotraghraṇājihva na kāyamanasi [15] na rūpāsabdagandharasapraṣṭāvyadharmā na [16] cakṣudhātu na vayodhātu na vijñānadhātu [17] na vidya na vidya na vidyakṣayai na vidya | [18] kṣāyo na jāramaraṇāṁ na jāramaraṇāṁ [19] kṣayo na duḥkhasamudaye niroddhamārga [20] na vijñānaṁ na prapti na bhīsamaya tasmad apra[21]ptitvā bodhisatvānāṁ prajñāpāramitām asṛ[22] tya viharaty acittāvaraṇa cittāvaraṇā na [23] stitvām atrasto viparyeso tikranta niṣṭhanirva[24] ṇāṁ tryadhvavyavasthita sarvabuddhā prajñāpāramitāṁ[25]m asṛtya anvattāraṁ samyaksaṁbodhim abhisaṁbu[26]ddhā tasma jñātavyaṁ prajñāpāramitā mahāmantra [27] mahāvidyāmantra anuttāramantra asamasa[28]mamantra sarvaduḥkhaprasama satyam amithya bu[29]ddhā prajñāpāramitām ukto mantra tadyathā ga[30]te 3 pāragate pārasaṁgate bodhicittā [31] svāhā ||

Appendix 3

After my contribution had been submitted to the editors of the volume, entirely by chance I happened upon the fact, to my knowledge not commonly mentioned in the literature, that the *Heart Sūtra* is attested in the Sanskrit Turfan materials. A single fragment is edited in Bechert and Wille 2000: 103–105 as item 1923. Here I simply reproduce Klaus Wille's reading, without adding the corrections he suggested, so as to give a truer picture of the form of the text as actually found in the leaf from Central Asia.

[v1] rāyāṁ prajñāpāramitāyā [car]tukāmas tenaiva śikṣitavya[2]ma [y]ad uta pañca skandhā svābhāvaśunyaḥ ka[th](aṁ pa)[ñ](ca) [s](ka)[n](dhā)[3]ḥ svabhāvaśunyaḥ rūpam eva śunyatā śunyataiva .. + + (rū)[4]paṁ pṛthāk śunyatāyā[ḥ] nāpi śunyatā .. + + + + + + (ve)[5] danāsaṁjñ[ā]saṁskāravijñānānāni [|] .. + + + + + (sarvadha)[6]rm[ā]ḥ svabhāvaśunya alakṣanā ajātā [a] + + + + + + + + [r1] .. .. rūddhā amalā vimalā a[nū]nā asasūrṇaṁ ˙ tasm(ā)t ta[rh](i) [2] śāriputra śunyatāyā na rūpaṁ na vedanā na sajñā na [s](aṁ)[3]skārā na vijñāna na

---

photos I have seen, while for most of the top line there is a space of approximately 11 syllables, nothing is legible (it may be that the word was written in some reddish color that has faded or not photographed well). While I was glad to be able to refer to his work, I made my transcription, kindly corrected, again, in a few instances by Peter Szanto, before seeing Lin's publication, with which I do not always agree (I think, for instance, he has missed some long vowels). Lin also distinguishes between *ś* and *s*, a difference I do not see; I think only the dental appears.

Without entering into detail, I briefly observe, far from exhaustively: l. 4: *tṛāṁs* is read by Lin simply as *tāṁ* but the form of *ta* is in that case not at all normal; l. 19: I am not certain of *samudaye* (*samudāya*?); l. 30: While we would expect 2, this certainly looks like a 3.

cakṣur na śruta pa ghāṇaṁ na jihvā na kā[y](o) [4] na mano na rūpaṁ n[ā] śabdho na gandho na raso na spraṣṭavyaṁ na dharmaḥ [5] na cakṣurdhatur na rūpardhatur na cakṣurvijñānadha[tur na] śruta[6]dhātur na śabdādhātur na śrutravijñānadhatuḥ ghrāṇadhatur na gandhadha[7]tuḥ na ghrāṇavijñānadhatur na jihvādhātur na rasadhatu jihvā

Literature[76)]

Attwood, Jayarava. 2019. "Xuanzang's Relationship to the *Heart Sūtra* in Light of the Fangshan Stele." *Journal of Chinese Buddhist Studies / Chung-hua Fo-hsüeh Hsüeh-pao* 中華佛學學報 32: 1–30.

Baba Norihisa 馬場紀壽. 2012. "*Hōkyōin-kyō* no denpa to tenkai: Suriranka no Daijō to Fukū, Enju, Chōgen, Keiha"『寶篋印經』の傳播と展開: スリランカの大乘と不空、延壽、重源、慶派 [The transmission and cultural influences of a *dhāraṇī* sūtra: From Sri Lankan Mahāyāna to Amoghavajra, Yongming Yanshou, Chōgen, and the Kei School]. *Bukkyōgaku* 佛教學 54: 1–21.

———. 2016. "Darani wa umi o koete—Suriranka no kyōten denpa to Higashi Ajia no Bukkyō bunka" 陀羅尼は海を越えて── スリランカの經典傳播と東アジアの佛教文化 [*Dhāraṇī*s cross the sea: The transmission of sūtras from Sri Lanka and the Buddhist culture of East Asia]. In Haneda Masashi 羽田正, ed., *Gurōbaru hisutorī to Higashi Ajiashi* グローバルヒストリーと東アジア史 [Global history and East Asian history], 133–156. Tokyo: Tōkyō Daigaku Shuppankai 東京大學出版會.

———. 2017. "From Sri Lanka to East Asia: A Short History of a Buddhist Scripture." In Benjamin A. Elman and Chao-Hui Jenny Liu, eds., *The 'Global' and the 'Local' in Early Modern and Modern East Asia*, 121–145. Leiden Series in Comparative Historiography 10. Leiden: Brill.

Bechert, Heinz, and Klaus Wille. 2000. *Sanskrithandschriften aus den Turfanfunden 8*. Verzeichnis der orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland X, 8. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag.

Bühnemann, Gudrun. 2014. "A *dhāraṇī* for Each Day of the Week: The *saptavāra* Tradition of the Newar Buddhists." *Bulletin of School of Oriental and African Studies* 77.1: 119–136.

Chapin, Helen B., revised by Alexander C. Soper. 1970. "A Long Roll of Buddhist Images II." *Artibus Asiae* 32.2/3: 157–199.

———. 1971. "A Long Roll of Buddhist Images IV." *Artibus Asiae* 33.1/2: 75–140.

76) In accordance with the norms of this journal, all Chinese, even from PRC authors, is romanized according to the Wade-Giles system.

Chen Shu-Fen 陳淑芬. 2004. “On Xuanzang’s Transliterated Version of the Sanskrit *Prajñāpāramitāhṛdayasūtra* (Heart Sutra).” *Monumenta Serica* 52.1: 113–159.

Cruijsen, Thomas, Arlo Griffiths and Marijke J. Klokke. 2013. “The Cult of the Buddhist *dhāraṇī* Deity Mahāpratisarā along the Maritime Silk Route: New Epigraphical and Iconographic Evidence from the Indonesian Archipelago.” *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 35.1/2: 71–157.

Forte, Antonino. Unpublished. “The Preface to the So-called Buddhapālita Chinese Version of the Buddhoṣṇīṣa Vijaya Dhāraṇī Sūtra.” 36-page typescript.

Fujiwara Takato 藤原崇人. 2011. “Hokutō hatsugen bunbutsu ni miru 11 seiki Ryōsei no Bukkyōteki shosō” 北塔發現文物に見る11世紀遼西の佛教的諸相 [The aspects of Buddhism on Liao-Hsi in the 11th century as seen through the relics from the north pagoda of Chao-yang]. *Kansai Daigaku Tōzai Gakujutsu Kenkyūjo Kiyō* 關西大學東西學術研究所紀要 44: 191–209.

Fukui Fumimasa 福井文雅. 1971. “Hannya shingyō to Tashingyō” 般若心經と多心經 [On the titles of the *Mahāprajñā-pāramitā-sūtra*s in China]. *Shūkyō Kenkyū* 宗教研究 206: 152–153.

———. 1982. “*Tashingyō* no seiritsu”「多心經」の成立 [The compilation of *To hsin ching*]. *Tendai Gakuhō* 天台學報 24: 74–81.

———. 1985. “Shinshutsu ‘Fukūyaku’ bonbun shahon Hannya shingyō” 新出「不空譯」梵本寫本般若心經 [A recently found Sanskrit text of the *Heart Sūtra* attributed to Amoghavajra]. In Nakamura Zuiryū Hakase Koki Kinenkai 中村瑞隆博士古稀記念會, ed., *Bukkyōgaku ronshū: Nakamura Zuiryū hakase koki kinen ronshū* 佛教學論集: 中村瑞隆博士古稀記念論集 [Studies in Buddhology: A collection of articles in honor of Professor Nakamura Zuiryū’s seventieth birthday], 229–246. Tokyo: Shunjūsha 春秋社.

———. 1989. “Shinhatsugen Jiken yakuon *Bonbon Hannya haramitta shingyō*” 新發現慈賢譯音『梵本般若波羅蜜多心經』[Recently discovered version of the Sanskrit *Heart Sūtra* in Chinese transliteration, attributed to Maitrībhadra (Tz‘u-hsien 慈賢, Xth century)]. *Bukkyōgaku* 26: 1–19.

———. 2000. *Hannya shingyō no sōgōteki kenkyū—rekishi, shakai, shiryō* 般若心經の總合的研究 ── 歷史・社會・資料 [A comprehensive study of the *Heart Sūtra*: History, society, and materials]. Tokyo: Shunjūsha 春秋社.

Galambos, Imre. 2010. “Scribal Notation in Medieval Chinese Manuscripts: The *hewen* (Ligature) and the *chongwen* (Duplication) Marks.” *Manuscript Cultures* 2: 5–9.

Giunta, Paolo. 2008. “The *Āryadhvajāgrakeyūrā nāma dhāraṇī*. Diplomatic Edition of MS Tucci 3.2.16.” In Francesco Sferra, ed., *Manuscripta Buddhica 1. Sanskrit Texts from Giuseppe Tucci’s Collection*, Part I, 187–194. Rome: Istituto Italiano per l’Africa e l’Oriente.

Goshima Kiyotaka 五島清隆. 2013. “Chibettoyaku *Hōkyōkyō*: wayaku to yakuchū (1)” チベ

ット譯『寶篋經』: 和譯と譯注 (1) [An annotated Japanese translation of the Tibetan version of the *Ratnakaraṇḍa* (1)]. *Bukkyō Gakubu Ronshū* 佛教學部論集 97: 29–56.

———. 2014. "Chibettoyaku *Hōkyōkyō*: wayaku to yakuchū (2)." *Bukkyō Gakubu Ronshū* 98: 27–54.

———. 2015. "Chibettoyaku *Hōkyōkyō*: wayaku to yakuchū (3)." *Bukkyō Gakubu Ronshū* 99: 29–54.

———. 2018. "Chibettoyaku *Hōkyōkyō*: wayaku to yakuchū (4–1)." *Bukkyō Daigaku Bukkyō Gakkai Kiyō* 佛教大學佛教學會紀要 23: 1–18.

———. 2019. "Chibettoyaku *Hōkyōkyō*: wayaku to yakuchū (4–2)." *Bukkyō Daigaku Bukkyō Gakkai Kiyō* 24: 33–49.

Harrison, Paul. 2010. "Experimental Core Samples of Chinese Translations of Two Buddhist *Sūtra*s Analysed in the Light of Recent Sanskrit Manuscript Discoveries." *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 31.1/2 (2008 [2010]): 205–249.

Hattori Atsuko 服部敦子. 2010. "Sen Kōshuku hachimanshisentō o meguru genjō to kadai" 錢弘俶八萬四千塔をめぐる現狀と課題 [Current research regarding Ch'ien Hung-ch'u's 84,000 stūpas]. *Asia Yūgaku* アジア遊學 134: 26–43.

Hidas, Gergely. 2012. *Mahāpratisarā-Mahāvidyārājñī, The Great Amulet, Great Queen of Spells. Introduction, Critical Editions and Annotated Translation*. Śata-piṭaka Series, Indo-Asian Literatures 636. New Delhi: International Academy of Indian Culture and Aditya Prakashan.

———. 2013. "Rituals in the *Mahāsāhasrapramardanasūtra*." In Nina Mirnig et al., eds., *Puṣpikā: Tracing Ancient India through Texts and Traditions*, 225–240. Contributions to Current Research in Indology 1. Oxford: Oxbow.

Hikata Ryūshō 干潟龍祥. 1939. "Butchō sonshō daranikyō shoden no kenkyū" 佛頂尊勝陀羅尼經諸傳の研究 [A study of the transmission of the *Uṣṇīṣavijayā dhāraṇī*]. *Mikkyō Kenkyū* 密教研究 68: 73–90.

Hinüber, Oskar von. 1989, "Two Dhāraṇī-Inscriptions from Tombs at Dali (Yunnan)." *The Journal of the Siam Society* 77.1: 55–59.

Howard, Angela Falco. 1997. "The Dhāraṇī Pillar of Kunming, Yunnan: A Legacy of Esoteric Buddhism and Burial Rites of the Bai People in the Kingdom of Dali (937–1253)." *Artibus Asiae* 57.1/2: 33–72.

Kiattisak Ponampon, Phra. 2018. "Dunhuang Manuscript S.2585: A Textual and Inter-disciplinary Study on Early Medieval Chinese Buddhist Meditative Techniques and Visionary Experiences." Master's thesis, University of Cambridge.

Kim, Youn-mi. 2013. "The Hidden Link: Tracing Liao Buddhism in Shingon Ritual." *Journal of Song-Yuan Studies* 43: 117–170.

Kimura Shūsei 木村秀成. 2018. "*Mahāpuratisarā* (*Daizuigu daranikyō*) ni okeru darani no sonkakuka ni tsuite—Hōshiyui yaku o chūshin ni" マハープラティサラー (大隨求陀羅尼

經)』におけるダラニの尊格化について――寶思惟譯を中心に [A study on the personification of *dhāraṇī* in the *Mahāpratisarādhāraṇī*: With a focus on Pao-ssu-wei's translation]. *Taishō Daigaku Daigakuin Kenkyū Ronshū* 大正大學大學院研究論集 42: 72–44.

Kokusai Bukkyōgaku Daigakuin Daigaku Nihon Koshakyō Kenkyūjo Monkashō Senryaku Purojekuto Jikkō Iinkai 國際佛教學大學院大學日本古寫經研究所文科省戰略プロジェクト實行委員會, ed. 2013. *Kongōji zō Hōkyōin daranikyō* 金剛寺藏寶篋印陀羅尼經 [Manuscripts in the Kongōji collection: The *Hōkyōin daranikyō*]. Nihon koshakyō zenpon sōkan 日本古寫經善本叢刊 6. Tokyo: Kokusai Bukkyōgaku Daigakuin Daigaku 國際佛教學大學院大學 (International College for Postgraduate Buddhist Studies).

Kotyk Jeffrey. 2019. "Chinese State and Buddhist Historical Sources on Xuanzang: Historicity and the *Daci'en si sanzang fashi zhuan* 大慈恩寺三藏法師傳." *T'oung Pao* 105: 513–544.

Kuo, Liying. 2006. "Inscriptions on 'Stone Banners' (*shichuang* 石幢): Text and Context." In *Chūgoku sekkoku bunken kenkyū kokusai wākushoppu hōkokusho* 中國石刻文獻研究國際ワークショップ報告書, 37–51. <http://coe21.zinbun.kyoto-u.ac.jp/sekkoku2006.pdf>

———. 2014. "Dhāraṇī Pillars in China: Functions and Symbols." In Dorothy C. Wong and Gustav Heldt, eds., *China and Beyond in the Mediaeval Period: Cultural Crossings and Inter-regional Connections*, 351–385. New Delhi: Manohar.

Ledderose, Lothar. 2004. "Changing the Audience: A Pivotal Period in the Great Sutra Carving Project at the Cloud Dwelling Monastery near Beijing." In John Lagerwey, ed., *Religion and Chinese Society, vol. 1: Ancient and Medieval China*, 385–409. Hong Kong: The Chinese University Press and École française d'Extrême-Orient.

Lessing, F. D., and Alex Wayman. 1968. *Introduction to the Buddhist Tantric Systems*. The Hague: Mouton.

Li Yü-min 李玉珉. 2005. "*Fan-hsiang chüan* tso-che yü nien-tai k'ao"《梵像卷》作者與年代考 [On the authorship and date of the Scroll of Buddhist Images]. *Ku-kung Hsüeh-shu Chi-k'an* 故宮學術季刊 23.1: 333–366.

Liao Hsiang-mei 廖湘美. 2008. "Tun-huang shih-shih *Hsin-ching* yin-hsieh ch'ao-pen so-fan-ying chih sheng-mu hsien-hsiang—chien-lun i-che kuei-shu wen-t'i" 敦煌石室《心經》音寫抄本所反映之聲母現象――兼論譯者歸屬問題 [The initial phenomenon of the Chinese transliteration of the *Heart Sutra* in the Tun-huang manuscripts]. *Chung-kuo Hsüeh-shu Nien-k'an* 中國學術年刊 30.2: 185–214.

Liebenthal, Walter. 1947. "Sanskrit Inscriptions from Yunnan I (and Dates of the Foundation of the Main Pagodas in that Province)." *Monumenta Serica* 12: 1–40.

———. 1955. "Sanskrit Inscriptions from Yunnan II (and More about the Pagodas and Statues of That Province)." *Sino-Indian Studies* 5.1: 46–68.

Lin Chia-fei 林家妃. 2014. "Tz'u-hsien yin-i fan-chou so fan-ying te han-yü yin-hsi: i fan-pen *Po-jo po-lo-mi-to hsin ching*, *Ta-sui-ch'iu t'o-lo-ni*, *Fo-shuo ju-i-lun lien-hua-hsin*

ju-lai hsiu-hsing kuan-men i ho *Miao-chi-hsiang p'ing-teng kuan-men ta-chiao-wang ching lüeh-ch'u hu-mo i* wei chung-hsin" 慈賢音譯梵咒所反映的漢語音系: 以梵本《般若波羅蜜多心經》、《大隨求陀羅尼》、《佛說如意輪蓮花心如來修行觀門儀》和《妙吉祥平等觀門大教王經略出護摩儀》爲中心 [The sound system of Chinese reflected in Sanskrit mantras transliterated by Tz'u-hsien: With a focus on the Sanskrit texts of the *Heart Sūtra*, *Mahāpratisarādhāraṇī*, *Fo-shuo ju-i-lun lien-hua-hsin ju-lai hsiu-hsing kuan-men i*, and *Miao-chi-hsiang p'ing-teng kuan-men ta-chiao-wang ching lüeh-ch'u hu-mo i*]. Master's thesis (碩士論文), Kuo-li Chung-yang Ta-hsüeh 國立中央大學 (Taiwan).

Lin Kuang-ming (Tony K.) 林光明. 2006. *Ch'eng-t'i fan-tzu ju-men* 城體梵字入門 [An introduction to the Indic scripts]. Taipei: Chia-feng Ch'u-pan-she 嘉豐出版社.

Lokesh Chandra. 1980. "Comparative Iconography of the Goddess Uṣṇīṣavijayā." *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 34.1/3: 125–137.

Mak, Bill M. 2020. "Sanskrit Uṣṇīṣavijayādhāraṇī Inscriptions in Dali/Yunnan." In L. Shravak and S. Roy, eds., *Investigating Principles: International Aspects of Indian Cultures*, 247–278. Mumbai: Somaiya Publications Pvt. Ltd.

Marciniak, Katarzyna. 2017. "The Oldest Paper Manuscript of the *Mahāvastu*." *Sōka Daigaku Kokusai Bukkyōgaku Kōtō Kenkyūjo Nenpō* 創價大學國際佛教學高等研究所年報 (*Annual Report of The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University*) 20: 103–121

Matsuda Kazunobu 松田和信. 2010. "Chūō Ajia no Bukkyō shahon" 中央アジアの佛教寫本 [Buddhist manuscripts of Central Asia]. In Nara Yasuaki 奈良康明 and Ishii Kōsei 石井公成, eds., *Shin Ajia Bukkyōshi: Chūō Ajia—Bunmei bunka no kōsaten* 新アジア佛教史・中央アジア ── 文明・文化の交差點 [A new history of Buddhism in Asia: Central Asia—An intersection of civilizations and cultures], 119–158. Tokyo: Kōsei Shuppan-sha 佼成出版社.

Melzer, Gudrun. 2007. "The Gilgit Manuscript of the Sarvagatipariśodhana-uṣṇīṣavijayā Kept in the Miho Museum." In Matsuda Kazunobu 松田和信, ed., *Hirayama Ikuo korekushon no Afuganisutan, Pakisutan shutsudo Bukkyō shahon kenkyū* 平山郁夫コレクションのアフガニスタン・パキスタン出土佛教寫本研究 [Investigating the Buddhist manuscripts from Afghanistan and Pakistan in the Hirayama Ikuo Collection], 107–116. Report on research findings for Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research (B), 2003–06 (No. 15320011).

Mori Masahide 森雅秀. n.d. "Kyōdō to darani shinkō" 經幢と陀羅尼信仰 [*Dhāraṇī* pillars and *dhāraṇī* cults]. Found at http://mmori.w3.kanazawa-u.ac.jp/works/misc/un_nan/un_nan2.html.

Müller, F[riedrich] Max, and Bunyiu Nanjio. 1884. *The Ancient Palm Leaves containing the Pragñâ-Pâramitâ- Hridaya-Sûtra and Ushnîsha-Vigaya-Dhâranî*. Anecdota Oxoniensia, Aryan Series Vol I.3. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Murata Jirō 村田治郎 and Fujieda Akira 藤枝晃. 1955–1957. *Kyoyōkan* 居庸關 [Chü-yung-kuan: The Buddhist arch pass of the fourteenth century A.D. at the pass of the Great Wall northwest of Peking]. Kyoto: Kyōtō Daigaku Kōgakubu 京都大學工學部.

Nagata Tetchō 長田徹澄. 1935. "Tonkō shutsudo Tōji shozō ryōbonbon Genjō sanzō on'yaku Hannya shingyō no kenkyū" 燉煌出土東寺所藏兩梵本玄奘三藏音譯般若心經の研究 [Two Sanskrit versions of Hsüan-tsang's transcribed *Heart Sūtra* from Tun-huang in the Tōji collections]. *Mikkyō Kenkyū* 密教研究 56: 63–94.

Okukaze Eikō 奥風榮弘. 2010. "Kōkiji zō shinshutsu no bonbun Kongō hannyakyō shahon ni tsuite (3)" 高貴寺藏新出の梵文金剛般若經寫本について (3) [New Sanskrit manuscripts of the *Vajracchedikā Prajnāpāramitā* preserved in Kōkiji Temple (3)]. *Bukkyō Daigaku Daigakuin Kiyō* 佛教大學大學院紀要 38: 1–12.

Orlina, Roderick. 2013. "Epigraphical Evidence for the Cult of Mahāpratisarā in the Philippines." *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 35.1/2: 159–169.

Quinter, David. 2007a. "Account of the Origin of the Hannyaji Mañjuśrī: A Translation of *Hannyaji Monju Engi*." *Monumenta Nipponica* 62.4: 459–468.

———. 2007b. "Votive Text for the Construction of the Hannyaji Mañjuśrī Bodhisattva Statue: A Translation of *Hannyaji Monju Bosatsu Zō Zōryū Ganmon*." *Monumenta Nipponica* 62.4: 469–479.

———. 2015. *From Outcasts to Emperors: Shingon Ritsu and the Mañjuśrī Cult in Medieval Japan*. Brill's Japanese Studies Library 50. Leiden: Brill.

Rosenfield, John M. 2014. "Notes on the *Jewel Casket Sutra* in Japan." In Dorothy C. Wong and Gustav Heldt, eds., *China and Beyond in the Mediaeval Period: Cultural Crossings and Inter-regional Connections*, 387–402. New Delhi: Manohar.

Sasaki Daiju 佐々木大樹. 2005. "Butchō sonshō darani no kenkyū—kan'yaku shohon no seiritsu o megutte" 佛頂尊勝陀羅尼の研究 ── 漢譯諸本の成立をめぐって [A study of the *Uṣṇīṣavijayā dhāraṇī*: On the formation of the Chinese translations]. *Kankoku Bukkyōgaku Seminar* 韓國佛教學SEMINAR 10: 134–152.

———. 2007. "*Butchō sonshō daranikyō* no kenkyū"『佛頂尊勝陀羅尼經』の研究 [A study of the *Uṣṇīṣavijayā dhāraṇī*]. *Chisan Gakuhō* 智山學報 56: 475–492.

———. 2008. "Butchō sonshō darani kyōdō no kenkyū" 佛頂尊勝陀羅尼經幢の研究 [A study of the *Uṣṇīṣavijayā dhāraṇī* carved on pillars]. *Chisan Gakuhō* 57: 41–67.

———. 2015. "Hōryūji baiyō *Butchō sonshō darani* no kenkyū—shinshutsu shiryō *Yamato no kuni Hōryūji shozō baitara bonkyō* nado e no tenkai" 法隆寺貝葉「佛頂尊勝陀羅尼」の研究 ── 新出資料『大倭國法隆寺所藏貝多羅梵經』等への展開 [The *Uṣṇīṣavijayā dhāraṇī* on the Hōryūji leaves: The development toward the new material *Yamato no kuni Hōryūji shozō baitara bonkyō*]. *HERITEX* 1 (Nagoya University): 193–205.

———. 2019. "Chibettoyaku *Butchō sonshō daranikyō* kyōgō tekisuto oyobi wayaku (1)" チベット譯『佛頂尊勝陀羅尼經』校合テキストおよび和譯 (1) [Collated text and Japanese

translation of the Tibetan translation of the *Uṣṇīṣavijayā nāma dhāraṇī* sūtra (1)]. *Kawasaki Daishi Kyōgaku Kenkyūjo Kiyō* 川崎大師教學研究所紀要 4: 43–75.

———. 2020. “Chibettoyaku *Butchō sonshō daranikyō* kyōgō tekisuto oyobi wayaku (2).” *Kawasaki Daishi Kyōgaku Kenkyūjo Kiyō* 5: 53–81.

Schopen, Gregory. 1977. “Sukhāvatī as a Generalized Religious Goal in Sanskrit Mahāyāna Sūtra Literature.” *Indo-Iranian Journal* 19: 177–210.

———. 1982. “The Text on the ‘Dhāraṇī Stones from Abhayagiriya’: A Minor Contribution to the Study of Mahāyāna Literature in Ceylon.” *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 5: 100–108.

Shen, Hsueh-Man. 2012. “Between One and Many: Multiples, Multiplication and the Huayan Metaphysics.” *Proceedings of the British Academy* 181: 205–258.

Silk, Jonathan A. 1994. *The Heart Sutra in Tibetan: A Critical Edition of the Two Recensions Contained in the Kanjur*. Wiener Studien zur Tibetologie und Buddhismus Kunde 34. Vienna: Arbeitskreis für Tibetische und Buddhistische Studien, Universität Wien.

Sørensen, Henrik H. 2011. “Esoteric Buddhism in the Nanzhao and Dali Kingdoms (Ca. 800–1253).” In Charles D. Orzech, Henrik H. Sørensen and Richard K. Payne, eds., *Esoteric Buddhism and the Tantras in East Asia*, 379–392. Leiden: Brill.

Suematsu Yasukazu 末松保和. 1985. “Kōrai Enpukuji shōmei ni tsuite” 高麗演福寺鐘銘について [On the Yŏnboksa bell in Korea]. *Tōyō Gakuhō* 東洋學報 66: 319–324.

Suzuki Hirotaka 鈴木廣隆. 1995. “*Hannya shingyō* no Nepāru shahon”『般若心經』のネパール寫本 [Sanskrit manuscripts of the *Prajñāpāramitāhṛdayasūtra* in Nepal]. *Indo Tetsugaku Bukkyōgaku* 印度哲學佛教學10: 167–182.

Takata Tokio 高田時雄. 1988. *Tonkō shiryō ni yoru Chūgokugoshi no kenkyū: kyū, jisseiki no Kasei hōgen* 敦煌資料による中國語史の研究: 九・十世紀の河西方言 [A study of the history of the Chinese language based on Tun-huang materials: The Ho-hsi dialect in the 9th and 10th centuries]. Tokyo: Sōbunsha 創文社.

Takubo Shūyo 田久保周譽 and Kanayama Shōkō 金山正好. 1981. *Bonji Shittan* 梵字悉曇 [The Siddham script]. Tokyo: Hirakawa Shuppansha 平河出版社.

Tanaka Kimiaki 田中公明. 2014. “Orissashū Udayagiri II shutsudo no sekkoku darani ni tsuite” オリッサ州ウダヤギリII出土の石刻陀羅尼について [On the stone carved *dhāraṇī*s from the Udayagiri II site in Odisha]. *Tōkyō Daigaku Shiryō Hensanjo Kenkyū Kiyō* 東京大學史料編纂所研究紀要 166: 151–161 (134–124), vi–vii.

Tung Kao 董高 and Chang Hung-po 張洪波. 1992. “Liao-ning Ch‘ao-yang Pei-t‘a t‘ien-kung ti-kung ch‘ing-li chien-pao” 遼寧朝陽北塔天宮地宮清理簡報 [A brief report on the restoration of the aboveground and underground depositories in the Northern Pagoda of Ch‘ao-yang in Liao-ning]. *Wen-wu* 文物 7 (434): 1–28.

Unebe Toshiya 畝部俊也. 2015. “Bonbun *Butchō sonshō daranikyō* to shoyaku no taishō kenkyū” 梵文『佛頂尊勝陀羅尼經』と諸譯の對照研究 [*Sarvagatipariśodhana-Uṣṇīṣa-*

vijayā nāma dhāraṇī: Sanskrit text collated with Tibetan and Chinese translations, along with Japanese translation]. *Nagoya Daigaku Bungakubu Kenkyū Ronshū* 名古屋大學文學部研究論集 61: 97–146.

Wan Chin-ch'uan 萬金川. 2004a. "Shih-shih *Hsin-ching* yin-hsieh ch'ao-pen chiao-shih ch'u-kao chih i" 石室《心經》音寫抄本校釋初稿之一 [The annotation of a phonetic transcription manuscript of the *Heart Sūtra* from Tun-huang 1]. *Fo-hsüeh Yen-chiu Chung-hsin Hsüeh-pao* 佛學研究中心學報 9: 73–118.

———. 2004b. "Shih-shih *Hsin-ching* yin-hsieh ch'ao-pen chiao-shih ch'u-kao chih erh" 石室《心經》音寫抄本校釋初稿之二 [The annotation of a phonetic transcription manuscript of the *Heart Sūtra* from Tun-huang 2]. *Yüan-kuang Fo-hsüeh Hsüeh-pao* 圓光佛學學報 9: 25–84.

———. 2004c. "Tun-huang shih-shih *Hsin-ching* yin-hsieh ch'ao-pen chiao-shih hsü-shuo" 敦煌石室《心經》音寫抄本校釋序說 [The annotation of a phonetic transcription manuscript of the *Heart Sūtra* from Tun-huang]. *Chung-hua Fo-hsüeh Hsüeh-pao* 中華佛學學報 17: 95–121.

Watanabe Shōgo 渡邊章悟. 2009. *Hannya shingyō—tekusuto, shisō, bunka* 般若心經 ── テクスト・思想・文化 [The *Heart Sūtra*: Text, thought, and culture]. Tokyo: Daihōrinkaku 大法輪閣.

———. 2012. *Etoki Hannya shingyō—Hannya shingyō no bunkateki kenkyū* 繪解き般若心經 ── 般若心經の文化的研究 [The *Heart Sūtra* in pictures: A cultural study of the *Heart Sūtra*]. Tokyo: Nonburusha ノンブル社.

———. 2016. "Some Questions Concerning the Title of the *Prajñāpāramitā-hṛdaya*[*-sūtra*]." *Chisan Gakuhō* 65: 21–34.

Watanabe Shōgo and Takahashi Hisao 高橋尙夫. 2016. *Hannya shingyō chūshaku shūsei: Indo, Chibetto hen* 般若心經註釋集成　インド・チベット編 [Collected commentaries on the *Heart Sūtra*: India and Tibet]. Urayasu: Kishin shobō 起心書房.

Waugh, Daniel C. 2011. "The Chaoyang Northern Pagoda. A Photo Essay." *The Silk Road* 9: 53–70.

Winternitz, Maurice. 1927. *A History of Indian Literature*, volume 2. Calcutta: University of Calcutta.

Wu, Pei-Jung. 2014. "Wooden Statues as Living Bodies: Deciphering the Meanings of the Deposits within Two Mañjuśrī Images of the Saidaiji Order." *Artibus Asiae* 74.1: 75–96.

Yaita Hideomi 矢板秀臣. 2001. "Hōryūji baiyō *Hannya shingyō* shahon ni tsuite no ichi hōkoku" 法隆寺貝葉『般若心經』寫本についての一報告 [A report on the Hōryūji palm-leaf manuscript of the *Prajñāpāramitāhṛdaya*]. *Chisan Gakuhō* 50: 7–16.

Yang, Zeng. 2018. "A Biographical Study on Bukong 不空 (aka. Amoghavajra, 705–774): Networks, Institutions, and Identities." Ph.D. thesis, The University of British Columbia.

Yuyama Akira 湯山明. 1985. "Enpukuji dōshō no Bongo meibun oboekagi: kono shōron o

Suematsu Yasuzaku kyōju ni sasagu” 演福寺銅鐘の梵語銘文覺書: この小論を末松保和教授に捧ぐ [The Sanskrit inscription cast on a bell at the Yeon-bog-jeol Temple in Korea]. *Tōyō Gakuhō* 66: 325–362.

———. 1989. “Die Sanskrit-Texte in Lan-tsha und in tibetischer (dBu-can) Schrift auf der im Jahre 1346 gegossenen Glocke des Tempels Yeon-bog-jeol in Korea.” In Einar von Schuler, ed., *Deutscher Orientalistentag: vom 16. bis 20. September 1985 in Würzburg: ausgewählte Vorträge XXIII*, 429–434. Stuttgart: F. Steiner Verlag Wiesbaden.

———. 2000. “An *Uṣṇīṣa-Vijaya Dharaṇī* Text from Nepal.” *Sōka Daigaku Kokusai Bukkyōgaku Kōtō Kenkyūjo Nenpō* 3: 165–175.

———. 2006. “Fukū on’yaku Tonkō shutsudo Butchō sonshō darani” 不空音譯敦煌出土佛頂尊勝陀羅尼 [Amoghavajra’s *Uṣṇīṣa-Vijaya Dharaṇī* from Tun-huang]. *Sōka Daigaku Kokusai Bukkyōgaku Kōtō Kenkyūjo Nenpō* 9: 231–276.

———. 2012a. “Gendai rufu Butchō sonshō darani kō—shinshutsu Seika rudenbon ni kanren shite” 元代流布佛頂尊勝陀羅尼考——新出西夏流傳本に關連して [Remarks on the *Uṣṇīṣa-Vijaya Dharaṇī* transmitted in the Yuan period: With reference to the newly recovered Hsi-hsia version]. *Sōka Daigaku Kokusai Bukkyōgaku Kōtō Kenkyūjo Nenpō* 15: 201–208.

———. 2012b. “An Enlarged Version of the *Uṣṇīṣa-Vijayā Dhāraṇī*: The Text Transmitted in the Yüan Period.” *Sōka Daigaku Kokusai Bukkyōgaku Kōtō Kenkyūjo Nenpō* 15: 195.