Tatsushi Tamai

Hōryūji's Dhāraṇī Texts Preserved in Tokyo National Museum

Abstract: The article comprises an analysis of a manuscript fragment stored in the Manuscript Collection of the Hōryūji Monastery (Japan). The manuscript contains excerpts from the "Heart Sutra of Perfect Wisdom" (*Prajñāpāramitā-hṛdaya-sūtra*) and *Uṣṇīṣavijaya-dhāraṇī*. The study of the manuscript text allows us to speak about the synthesis of Buddhism and Śaivism in the Serindia oases. The author of the article concludes that this manuscript is of particular importance for the study of the history of Central Asian Buddhism.

About the author: Tatsushi Tamai, Representative of Lab. Serindia Assoc. Inc. (Tokyo, Japan)

Provenance

The Tokyo National Museum Collection contains a manuscript known as the "Dhāraṇī text of Hōryūji" (hereafter Ho.Ms.), preserved along with the *Prajñāpāramitāhṛdaya* (多心経, *duōxīnjīng*) *Uṣṇīṣavijayadhāraṇī* (仏頂, *fódǐng*) and an Akṣara list. According to Müller, "We have good evidence, showing that these leaves were brought to Japan in 609 A.D., and that they came from China. <…> in China they (= Ho.Ms.) belonged to the monk Yashi, who died in 577 A.D., and before him to Bodhidharma, who emigrated from India to China in 520 A.D."[1] And then this Sanskrit manuscript was kept at the Hōryūji temple in Nara.

The Ho.Ms. was presumably written on a poor-quality plant leaf or hemp paper, the fiber of which can be seen on the published photo. Apparently, it is not written on good-quality paper, e.g. so-called *Cai Hou paper* (蔡侯紙 Chin.

---

[1] MÜLLER & NANJIO 1884: 64.

càihóuzhǐ Jap. *saikōshi*) which was supposedly produced since 105 CE. In Dunhuang, the quality of paper began to deteriorate after the Tibetan invasion, as Yoshida mentions.[2] Nowadays, such low-quality paper is still produced in Khotan or in Bhutan.

The script is so-called '*Siddham*' (悉曇文字 Chin. *xītánwénzì* Jap. *shittanmoji*) which was developed from the Gupta script around the 6th c., and used especially in esoteric Buddhism. Siddham developed further to the *Nāgarī* script in the 7th c., and then to Devanāgarī in the 10th c. According to Müller, the alphabet with 'wedges' (e.g. at the top of vertical lines) existed in the fourth century and perhaps earlier.[3] A reed pen could be used to write the Sanskrit text because of the wedges,[4] but the photo makes it clear that a brush was used for the Chinese characters *duōxīnjīng* 多心経 and *fódíng* 仏頂 at the beginning of the Sanskrit text. They were likely written as a memo, because they are positioned vertically from left to right alongside the Sanskrit sentence, i.e. rotated 90 degrees, and their ink seems lighter than the one used for the Sanskrit characters.

The size is 4.9×28 cm with two string holes which are not necessary for so small a manuscript, and without numbers on both folios.

Some scholars supposed that Ho.Ms. is a fake, e.g. Matsuda mentions that it is not written on genuine palm leaf, not written by a specialist judging from poor script, and written later than the 9th c. based on its paleographical features. Therefore, Ho.Ms. is not the oldest manuscript in Japan, as claimed, and is surely a 'fake manuscript', because it was not written in India.[5] I, however, cannot understand his argument or grounds. There are many Mss. written with unskillful letters by novices or not specialists, but Ho.Ms. was written skillfully, in my opinion, although admittedly it contains some mistakes, as happens often in manuscripts.

Yaita mentions that the same ink was used both for the Sanskrit text and the Chinese characters *duōxīnjīng* 多心経 and *fódǐng* 仏頂. Therefore, he suggests, Ho.Ms. must have been written in China, Japan or Korea. However, there were many Chinese monks in Central Asia or Serindia, who studied Buddhism, such as the famous Xuánzàng (cf. 小野玄妙 G. Ono 1923 pp. 115–132). And also Yaita mentions[6] that the writing mistake *pāra-* →

---

[2] YOSHIDA 2009: 291.
[3] MÜLLER & NANJIO 1884: 94.
[4] Ibid.: 66.
[5] MATSUDA 2010: 129.
[6] YAITA 2001: 9.

prā- was caused by Chinese sound/pronunciation (漢音 *hànyīn*) → Sanskrit letter (梵字 *fànzì*), but it could also be explained easily by the influence of Tocharian phonology on the scribe. It possessed no long vowels as phonemes and showed a peculiar accent system, i.e. the second syllable of more than 3 syllables was always accented, and unaccented *ā* (grapheme) became *a* (phoneme), and unaccented *a* became *ä*, and often disappeared (syncope). Therefore, we get *pāra → prā* in r7. Other examples in Serindia: in Khot. we can see the change *dār > drā* in *śśandrāmata* '*devatā*-deity, Skt. *śrī*[7] or a back formation of Skt. **pra**mukhā / Pāli **pā**mokkhā / Chin. 波羅無呵 **pwâ lâ** mju xâ.[8] It is also possible to see an assimilation with <prajñā> or it could be explained by a general "r-metathesis".

Another doubt was raised by J. Silk[9] with regard to the character 仏 instead of 佛,[10] which is thought to be evidence for Japanese production, but this 仏 appeared already during the Six Dynasties (六朝 Liùcháo 220–589 CE) in Chinese texts as *suzi* (俗字, popular or vernacular character) of the formal character *fó* 佛.[11] Later the character 佛 was used in Buddhist literature because of its dignity.

The material, script and form of Ho.Ms. are very similar to the ones seen in Sanskrit manuscripts preserved in the China Ethnic Library in Beijing (5×48 cm with two string holes), which were published by Ye Shaoyong in 2021.[12] According to him they were brought from Tibet and date paleographically to the 8–9th cc. And the letters of Ho.Ms. are also similar (especially *-y* of ligature) to those in Sanskrit manuscripts of the Serindia Collection at the IOM RAS in St. Petersburg (SI 1943, etc.) published by Vorobyeva-Desyatovskaya and Tyomkin as "Fragments of Sanskrit Manuscripts on Birch-Bark from Kucha" in *Manuscripta Orientalia* 1998, although its script is old southern Brāhmī (not Northern Brāhmī used in Kucha). From these facts, I suppose that the 'Siddham script' could be derived from those of the Serindia area.

Ho.Ms. is small in size, half the normal length (28 cm to 48 cm), but with two string holes, although one is enough for such a small size, i.e. it could mean that this is a portable manuscript as mentioned by Yoshida: "The

---

[7] Cf. Bailey 1979: 395; Ito 1979: 309.

[8] Cf. Karashima 1994: 128.

[9] Silk 2021: 106, fn.33.

[10] Both characters sound in Japanese as *hotoke* ('Buddha').

[11] Xu 2021: 240.

[12] Ye Shaoyong 2021: 1054.

smaller size of the manuscript may indicate that it was carried by its owner as a sort of talisman. One may be reminded that when Xuanzang lost his way in the Taklamakan desert, he prayed earnestly to the Bodhisattva Avalokiteś-vara".[13] It could mean that Ho.Ms. was an 'amulet' as suggested by Silk.[14]

Since the backsides contain no writing,[15] these two manuscripts were originally a single folio, i.e. normal recto/verso style, but double sheets made the materials stronger for portable usage. This can also be inferred from the fact that no number is written on two folios. This separation of doubled materials happens when the glue loses its adhesiveness, as is often seen in the case of birch bark and paper.

1. A study of Ho.Ms. with detailed observations

Transliteration of Ho.Ms.-1 *Prajñāpāramitāhṛdaya* with Chinese parallel in *Táng Sānzāng Fǎshī Xuán Zhuāng yì Pánruò-bōluómì-duōxīn-jīng* 唐三藏法師玄裝譯 般若波羅蜜多心經 ('The Heart Sūtra of Prajñā-pāramitā translated by Tang Tripiṭaka Master Xuán Zhuāng')

Notes: parts in italics show that there are no correspondences in the parallel version; bold marks are mistakes; (←) indicates corrections. T refers to Tai-shō shinshū Daizōkyō 大正新修大蔵経.

recto
1. (Siddham) <u>*namas sarvajñāya*</u> *ārya*valokiteśvara bodhisatvo ganbhīraṃ(←āyāṃ?) prajñāpāramitā**ya**(←ā)ṃ caryāṃ caramāno vyavalo-kayati(*examines carefully*) sma paṃcaskandhās *tāś ca* svabhāvaśūnyaṃ *paśya-*
観 自 在 菩 薩 行 深 般 若 波 羅 蜜 多 *時*、照 見 五 蘊 皆 空 *度 一 切 苦 厄*。
(T0251_.08.0848c06)
2. *ti sma iha* śāriputra *rūpaṃ śūnyatā śūnyataiva rūpaṃ* rūpān na pṛthak, śūnyatā śūnyatāy*ā* na pṛthag rūpaṃ yadrūpaṃ sā śūnyatāyā śūnyatā tadrūpaṃ
舍 利 子 。 色 不 異 空 。 空 不 異 色 。 色 即 是 空 。 空 即 是 色 。
(T0251_.08.0848c07-08)
evameva veda-

---

[13] Yoshida 2009: 296.
[14] Silk 2021: 112.
[15] Yaita 2001: 13, as well as personal communication from the curator of the Tokyo Museum.

3.　nā-saṃjñā-saṃskāra-vijñānāni　iha　śaripu〇tra　sarvadharmā śūnyatālakṣaṇā anutpannā **yu**(←a)nir*ū*ddhā amarā vimalā nonā na paripūrṇā (reversed) tasmāc *chāriputra* śūnyatā-

受想行識亦復如是。舍利子。是諸法空想。不生不滅不垢不浄。不增不減。是故空中 (T0251_.08.0848c08-10)

4. yāṃ na rūpaṃ na vedanā <na> saṃjñā na saṃskārā na 〇 vijñāni na cakṣu-śrotra-ghrāṇa-jihvā-kāya-manā[ṃ]si　na　rūpaṃ-śabda-gandha-〇rasa-spraṣṭavya-dharmā na cakṣurdhātu yāvan na ma-

無色無受想行識。無眼耳鼻舌身意。無色聲香味觸法。無眼界。乃至無 (T0251_.08.0848c10-12)

5. nodhātu *na vidyā* nāvidyā *na vidyākṣayo* nāvidyākṣayo yāvan na jarāmaraṇaṃ na jarāmaraṇakṣayo na duḥkha-samudaya-nirodha-mārga na jñānaṃ na prāptitvaṃ bodhisattva*sya* prajñāpārami-

意識界。無無明。亦無無明盡。乃至無老死。亦無老死盡。無苦集滅道。無智亦無得。*以無所得故*。菩提薩埵*依般若波羅蜜多故*。(T0251_.08.0848c12-14)

6. tām *āśṛtya*(√śṛ 'resort'+ tya / ā**ś**ritya 'having recourse to, practicing') *viharati* citta*varaṇaḥ*(√vṛ 'choose'; 'enclosing'? 中村 **a**-cittā) cittāvaraṇa nāstit[v]ād atrasto vipary[ā]s('overturning'顛倒)ātikrāntaḥ('surpassed'遠離) niṣṭ<h>a(←ā 究竟)nirvāṇaḥ try*adhvavyavasthitā* (道・住 way-situated) sarvabuddhāḥ prajñāpāramitām āśṛtyānuttarāṃ samyaksaṃbodhim abhi-

心*無*罣礙（妨げ）。無罣礙故。無*有*恐怖。遠離*一切*顛倒*無想*。究竟（結極）涅槃。三*世*諸佛。依般若波羅蜜多故。得阿耨多羅三藐三菩提。(T0251_.08.0848c14-17)

7.　saṃbuddhā [t]asmā jñātavyaṃ prajñā**prā**(←pāra)mitā mahāmaṃtrā mahāvidyāmaṃtraḥ anuttaramaṃtra asa-

故知般若波羅蜜多。*是大神咒。是大明咒。是無上咒。* (T0251_.08.0848c17-18)

verso
1. mas{r}amamaṃtra sarvaduḥkha*praśamanaḥ* satyam amithy**etvāk,** (← -ātvāt)

prajñāpāramit*āyām* ukto maṃtraḥ tadyathā gategate pāragate pārasaṃgate bodhisvāha ‖ : ‖ prajñāpāramitahṛ(da)ya *samāptā*

是無等等咒。*能*除一切苦。眞實不虚故。説般若波羅蜜多咒。即説*咒曰*。掲帝 掲帝 般羅掲帝 般羅僧掲帝 菩提僧莎訶 般若波羅蜜多心經 (T0251_.08.0848c18-23)

There are so many discrepancies between the Sanskrit and Chinese versions including a lack of mutual correspondence that it is clear that one is not a direct translation from the other. Presumably this *Prajñāpāramitāhṛdaya* could be an interpretation citing *Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikā-prajñāpāramitā Sūtra* § 1 and § 2,[16] but it is very difficult to find any synchronic and diachronic relationship with regard to the problem of its authenticity, e.g. "The Sūtra of the dhāraṇī of the Great Enlightenment" (大明呪経 *Dàmíng zhòu jīng*) by Kumārajīva could be close to Xuanzang's "The Heart Sūtra [of Prajñā-pāramitā]" (心経 *Xīn jīng*) as discussed by Harada,[17] but I am not sure that we can decide a relationship or problem of authenticity only based on usage of words or sentences in texts. There were always changes (corruptions or developments with addition or deletion of words and sentences) of texts from time to time and place to place, e.g. we can find some texts in Tocharian which are so changed or corrupted from originals that we can recognize only personal names in original texts.[18]

The Prajñāpāramitāhṛdaya in Ho.Ms. was shortened in order to make a portable small text, e.g. *evam eva vedanā-saṃjñā-saṃskāra-vijñānāni* without explanation one by one of 4 of the 5 *skandha*s, or only one *bodhi* instead of multiple *bodhi*s in other texts.[19]

Transliteration of Ho.Ms.-2 *Uṣṇīṣavijayadhāraṇī* and 仏陀波利訳 **仏頂尊勝陀羅尼**, Jap. *Buddahari yaku butchō-sonshō-darani* ('The Dhāraṇi dedicated to the Buddha's growth on his head (←a topknot; one of 32 *lakṣaṇa*s of the Buddha) translated by Buddhahari').

Notes: I transliterate the *Uṣṇīṣavijayadhāraṇī* in Ho.Ms. and correct it using Unebe's model,[20] which is based on Melzer's transliteration of the Gilgit Ms. now kept in Miho Museum, and Unebe's supplement of the collated text. I cite Unebe's model for comparing the Sanskrit text and its Chinese version (T.967_19.352a26).

(←) indicates corrections, i.e. when the actual writings are mistakes; < > indicates text written in the model; { } indicates text not written in the model; [ ] indicates uncertain readings; ( ) indicates possible readings; ◯ represents a string hole.

---

[16] Harada 2010: 13.
[17] Harada 2010: 48.
[18] Tamai 2022: 1181–1183.
[19] Harada 2010: 383.
[20] Unebe 2015: 25.

verso

2. (Siddham) namas trail[o]kya prativis(←ś)iṣṭāya buddhāya bhagavate tadyathā oṃ vis(←ś)odhaya sama-samantāvabhāsa-spharana(←ṇa)-gati-gahana-svabhāva-śuddhe(←i) abhiṣiṃca{tu} {māṃ} sugatavacanāmṛtābhiṣe-

3. ke <ā>harāharā āya(←yu)ḥ-saṃntā(←dhā)raṇi śodhaya śodhaya gagana-vis(←ś)uddhe uṣṇ[ī]ṣa-vijaya-s(←ś)uddhe sahasra<ka>-ramyi(←raśmi)-saṃcodite sarvatathāgatādhiṣṭ<h>ānādhiṣṭhita(←e) mudre vajrā-kāya-saṃhatana-s(←ś)uddhe

4. sarva(←ā)varana-<bhaya>-vis(←ś)uddhe pratinivartaya-āyu-◯s(←ś)uddhe samayādhist<h>ite man(←ṇ)i man(←ṇ)i tathā(←a)tā-bhuta-{kuta}k(o)ṭi {•} paris(←ś)uddhe visphut(←ṭ)ā-◯buddhi-śuddhe jā(←a)ya jā(←a)ya vijā(←a)ya vijā(←a)ya sp(←sm)ara sarva(←smara) bu-

5. ddhādhiṣṭ<h>ita-s(←ś)uddhe vajre(←i) vajrā(←a)-garbhe vajraṃ bhavatu mama sarva-satvānāṃ ca kāya-vis(←ś)uddhe sarva-gati-parisuddhe sarva-tathāgatā(←a)- samās(←ś)vāsādhiṣṭhite bu<d>dhya bu<d>dhya bodhaya {vi}bodhaya {sādhaya

6. visodhaya sarvakarmavaraṇāni sama}samanta-paris(←ś)uddhe sarva-tathāgatādhiṣṭhānādhiṣṭhite svāhā ‖ : ‖ uṣṇīṣavijā yathārani sama(←ā)ptā ☐ ☐ ‖ ‖

The Sanskrit text[21]

(1) namo bhagavate trailokya-prativisisthaya buddhaya bhagavata. (2) tadyathā oṃ (3) viśodhaya samasamantāvabhāsa-spharaṇa-gati-gahana-svabhāva-śuddhi. (4) abhiṣiñca sugata-vacana-amṛtâbhiṣeke āhara āhara āyu-saṃdhāraṇi. (5) śodhaya śodhaya gagana-viśuddhe uṣṇīṣa-vijaya-śuddhe sahasraka-raśmi-saṃcodite sarva- tathāgatādhiṣṭhāna-adhiṣṭhite mudre vajra-kāya-saṃhatana-śuddhe sarvāvaraṇa- visuddhe (6) pratinivartaya-āyu-śuddhe samayadhiṣṭhite. maṇi maṇi tathatā-bhūta-koṭi- pariśuddhe (7) visphuṭa-buddhi-śuddhe jaya jaya vijaya vijaya smara smara (8) buddha-adhiṣṭhita-śuddhe vajri vajra-garbhe vajraṃ bhavatu mama (9) sarva-satvānāṃ ca kāya-viśuddhe sarva-gati-pariśuddhe sarva-tathāgata-samāśvāsādhiṣṭhite. budhya budhya bodhaya bodhaya samanta-pariśuddhe sarva-tathāgatâdhiṣṭhāna-adhiṣṭhite (10) svaha

---

[21] UNEBE 2015: 24; SASAKI 2009: 226; MELZER 2007: 109.

The Chinese version T967.19.352a26 佛頂尊勝陀羅尼經, *Fó dǐng zūn shèng tuóluóní jīng*[22]

a28: (1) 那莫薄伽跋帝 啼隷路迦–鉢囉底 毘失瑟咤啷 勃陀耶 薄伽跋底 (2)怛姪他唵(3)毘輸陀耶 娑摩-三漫多皤婆娑-娑破囉拏-揭底-伽訶那-娑婆皤-輸躓地(4)阿鼻詵者 蘇揭多-伐折那-阿㘑 㗚多毘曬羼 阿訶羅 阿訶羅 阿輸-散陀羅尼(5)輸馱多 輸馱耶 伽伽那-毘躓提-烏瑟尼沙-毘逝耶-躓提 娑訶 娑囉喝-囉濕弭-珊珠地帝薩婆-怛他揭多地瑟咤那-頞地瑟恥帝慕㘑 隷 跋折囉-迦耶-僧訶多那-躓提 薩婆伐羅拏-毘躓提(6)鉢羅底 儞伐怛耶 阿瑜躓提 薩末耶-阿地瑟恥帝 末禰 末禰 怛闥多-部多-俱胝-鉢唎躓提(7)毘薩普㘄-勃地-躓提社耶 社耶 毘社耶 毘社耶 薩末囉 薩末囉(8)勃陀頞地 瑟恥多-躓提 跋折梨 跋折囉-揭鞞 跋折濫 婆伐都麼麼 [受持者於此自稱名] (9)薩婆-薩埵㖱 迦耶-毘 躓提 薩婆-揭底-鉢唎躓提 薩婆-怛他揭多-三摩濕婆娑-遏地恥帝 勃陀 勃陀 蒲馱耶 蒲馱耶 三漫多-鉢唎躓提 薩婆-怛他揭多地瑟咤那-頞地瑟恥帝(10)娑婆訶

The Japanese monk Jōgon 浄厳 (1639–1702) stated the following: The text for the most part agrees with all the eight Chinese translations by 佛陀波利 Buddhapāla (A.D. 676), 杜行顗 (A.D. 679), 地婆訶羅 Divākara (two versions A.D. 682), 義浄 I-jing (A.D. 710), 無畏 Śubhakarasiṃha (A.D.716–735), 不空 Amoghavajra (A.D. 741–774), 逍宋 (of Tang dynasty A.D. 618–907), and 法天 (Dharmadeva? A.D. 973–981, of the Kao family A.D. 960–1127); though it is still not certain which translator used this text.[23]

After the *Kāraṇḍavyūha*, the *Uṣṇīṣavijayadhāraṇī* begins on f. 52v3 in Reel No. A 39-5 of the Nepalese-German Manuscript Cataloguing Project as follows:

○ ❖ namo budhāya || oṃ namo bhagavate○ sarvatrailokyaprativiśiṣṭāya buddhāya bhagavate namaḥ || tadyathā oṃ śidhaya śodhaya viśodhaya viśodhaya samasamantāvabhāsasya raṇagati ○ gaganasvabhāvaviśuddhe abhiṣiñcantu māṃ śrībodhiguptasya sarvatathāgatās sugatāvaravacanāmṛtābhiṣekaiḥ mahāmudrāmantrapadaiḥ | āhara āhara āyusaṃdhāraṇi śodhaya viśodhaya viśodhaya gaganasvabhāvaviśuddhe uṣṇīṣavijayapariśuddhe sahasraraśmisaṃcodite etc. (f. 52v3)

sahasrakṛtvaḥ pradakṣiṇīkṛtya bhagavataḥ purata sthitvā tathaiva codānayi ○ tvā bhagavataḥ purato niṣaṇṇā dharmaśravaṇāya | atha bhagavān suvarṇṇabāhuṃ pra○sārya supratiṣṭhitaṃ devaputraṃ samāśvāsya dharma-deśanām akarot || yāvad buddhatve tam vyākṛtavān iti || ❀ || (f. 56r2–3)

[22] UNEBE 2015: 25.
[23] MÜLLER & NANJIO 1884: 15–16.

Transliteration of Ho.Ms. (Akṣara list)

7. (Siddham) siddhaṃ a ā i [ī] u ū ṛ ṝ ḷ Ḹ e ai o au aṃ aḥ ka kha ga gha ṅa ca cha ja jha ña ṭa ṭha ḍa ḍha ṇa ta tha da dha na pa pha ba bha ma ya ra la [v]a śa ṣa sa ha llaṃ k[ṣ]a (51 Akṣaras) + + + (3–4 ligatures?)

The Akṣara list is important, as mentioned in 声字実相義 *Shō-ji-jissō-gi* 'The meaning of the true state of voice and letters' written by Kūkai 空海 (around 820 CE): we can see various teachings in *Bījākṣara*s (the 'seed syllables' or first syllables of a mantra or spell), and also in other Sanskrit texts, many descriptions for the learning of syllables, e.g. in Lalitavistara *lipiṃ śiṣyante* 'they study a letter (one by one)',[24] or in *Tathāgataguhya-sūtra* 'The Tathāgata's Secret Sūtra' (如来秘密経 Nyorai-himitsu-kyō): *vākkarmāṇy ākāraḥ (阿字) karma karoty* 'the character of 'a' operates on functions of the words'.[25] And in esoteric Buddhism, *Bījākṣara*s 種子 show the names of the Buddhas, Bodhisattvas and so on, and also could be an object of meditation.[26] The syllable theory is developed based on *śunyatā* 'emptiness' thought of *Prajñāpāramitā-sūtra* and also in the Dainichi-kyō 大日経, (Skt. *Mahāvairocana-sūtra*).[27]

This Akṣara list shows the normal 50 Akṣaras (opposed to "Aparacana" with 42 Akṣaras) plus ligature <llaṃ> which can be seen in the Tocharian writing system, and <ṛ, ṝ, ḷ, Ḹ> are treated as vowels, which are written at the end of the list of 50 Akṣaras. We can see lacunae with 3 or 4 Akṣaras in our Ms., which could be filled with <tsa, ska, śca>, if the scribe was influenced by Tocharian, because in Tocharian <lla> is written as an example of a typical ligature. According to Yamamoto,[28] the ligature list of *arapacana* <ṣṭa, śva, kṣa, sta, jña, rtha, sma, hva, tsa, ska, ysa, śca> were not proper syllables in Sanskrit, and Salomon argues that the origin of "Arapacana" with ligatures is Gāndhārī,[29] but I suppose that there were no ligatures originally in Gāndhārī, but ligatures were eventually constructed out of necessity with Kharoṣṭhī signs because of Sanskrit texts. I cannot find <jña, hva, tsa, ska, ysa, śca> in the list in "Kharoṣṭhī Inscriptions 1920." <hva, ysa> were used in Khotanese as local usage, <tsa, śca> are often found in Tocharian, and <jña, ska> are

---

[24] HOKAZONO 1994: 528.
[25] IKUMA 2019: 891.
[26] YAMAMOTO 2006: 99.
[27] YAMAMOTO 2006: 101.
[28] YAMAMOTO 2006: 88.
[29] SALOMON 1990: 257.

common in Sanskrit. From these ligatures, I cannot understand the Kharoṣṭhī character <ɟ> (horizontal line over <j>) for YSA and <c̄> (horizontal line over <c>) for ŚCA in Salomon's study.[30] The horizontal straight line over characters is very much disputable,[31] and I suppose that this sign shows a gemination, but it is not clear.

"Arapacana" could be a list of syllables of local usage for their local language including those found in Sanskrit texts.

The shape of the approximant (earlier known as semi-consonant and semi-vowel) /ḷ/ in the Akṣara list is very similar to the so-called 'Fremd Zeichen' /lä/ (consonant /l/ plus shwa /ä/) in Tocharian, and I have never considered it a vowel in Tocharian. This shape came presumably from the earliest Brāhmī written in Aśokan inscriptions. As it is difficult to think that Siddhamātṛkā /ḷ/ came directly from Aśokan Brāhmī, it is natural that the shape of /ḷ/ came from Tocharian. Then, also taking into account /lla/, Ho.Ms. and Siddham script could have been produced in Serindia, including Gilgit, Nepal and Tibet. Here we must disagree with what Jōgon 浄厳 wrote in 1694: "four letters of ṛi etc. (= ṛī, ḷi, ḷī) are added. It shows that these are the Brahma letters (梵字) of Central India."[32]

J. Silk writes: "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 'sūtra banner', or, apparently more usually, *shih-ch'uang* 石幢 'octagonal stone monument' in China".[33]

As a sub-conclusion, Ho.Ms. appears to be a pure Dhāraṇī text with the essence of Prajñāpāramitā-philosophy, i.e. *Śūnyatā* and so on, which prevailed as the main Buddhist teaching.[34] And it was necessary to make it portable for reading, reciting and writing at any place or time in order to protect the man who carried it from every kind of misery. For example, it is written in the 'Legend of Buddhist priest who masters Tripiṭaka' 三蔵法師伝 that Xuánzàng could not get rid of demons by praying to Avalokiteśvara, but he could do it by reciting the *Hṛdaya-sūtra*.[35] We can recognize this story from a Sogdian document,[36] and the text of "Dhāraṇī ring" (陀羅尼輪

---

[30] SALOMON 1990: 269.
[31] BROUGH 1962: 62–63.
[32] MÜLLER & NANJIO 1884: 16.
[33] SILK 2021: 108.
[34] SILK 2021: 116, Appendix 3; HARADA 2010: 48.
[35] WATANABE 2018: 265.
[36] YOSHIDA 2009: 296.

tuóluóní lún) from Dunhuang: 'If a man <u>carries</u> it with him, he can destroy his sin…' (若<u>帶持</u>者罪滅, *ruò dài chí zhě zuì miè*),[37] and also one could get merit, for example, as in the case of *Kāraṇḍavyūha* (*KV*): the one will be happy who addresses *KV*, makes others write *KV*, makes others accept *KV*, makes others recite *KV*, makes others hold *KV* as memorial service, and makes others ponder.[38]

2. Diachronic and synchronic investigation of Avalokiteśvara

Karashima writes: 'An illustrative example of this sort of misunderstanding is *Avalokitasvara* and *Avalokiteśvara*. There are at least eight old Sanskrit fragments from Central Asia which bear the name *Avalokitasvara*, as well as one fragment from Kizil, which has (*Apa*)*lokidasvara*. These older forms agree with the early Chinese renderings "One who observes sounds" and "One who observes sounds of the world"(窺音, 現音聲, 光世音, 觀世音), which were made between the 2nd and 5th cc., while the newer form *Avalokiteśvara*, which first appears in a Mathurā inscription of the Gupta year 148 (467/468 C.E.) and later in the Gilgit manuscript of the Lotus Sutra, dating back to the 7th c., agrees with the newer Chinese renderings "One who observes the sovereignty of the world" and "One who observes sovereignty" (觀世自在, 觀自在) from the 6th c. onwards. We cannot say for certain that the older forms are "corruptions" of the newer ones'.[39]

Mironov proved that 観(世)音, *Guān(shì)yīn* in *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka* was not a mistake, because he found *avalokitasvara* in manuscripts which were brought from Xīnjiāng by the Ōtani Expedition, now kept in Lüshun.[40]

Until the 5th c., *svara* (Chin. 音, *yīn*) — 'sound' — was mainly written, i.e. 光世音普門品, *Guāng shì yīn pǔ mén pǐn* ('Guangshiyin, the Bodhisattva of Compassion or Goddess of Mercy') in 'The Lotus Sūtra' by Dharmarakṣa (286 CE) (T263.09.128c19) or 妙音菩薩品, *Miàoyīn púsà pǐn* 'The section of the Wonderful Sound Bodhisattva' in Kumārajīva's translation of the same Sūtra (T262.09.56c03), and then *īśvara* (Chin. 自在, *zìzài*) was written by Xuánzàng (602–664 CE).

The chronological change is: *Ābhā-loka-svara* (in 'The lotus Sutra' by Dharmarakṣa) → *Ava-lokita-svara* (Kumārajīva) → Avalokiteśvara (Xuán-

---

[37] WATANABE 2018: 96.
[38] SAKUMA 2021: 814.
[39] KARASHIMA 2015: 113–114.
[40] MIRONOV 1927: 243.

zàng), but Avalokitasvara (Chin. 観音 *Guānyīn*) became common within China and Japan.

I suppose that *ābhā-loka-svara* would be the original form when we see the Tocharian expression, as Karashima mentions: Toch. *apa-lokita-svara* shows the Tocharian phonology, i.e. no long vowel (unaccented '*ā*' could be written as '*a*') and no aspirated voiced sound ('*bh*' → '*p*').

The Tocharian word '*apa*' is either the same as Pāli *apa* ('apart') + *lokita* (Chin. 求聴 *qiú tīng* 'seeking to hear' or 照見 *zhào jiàn* 'clearly seeing'[41]), or *ava* + *lokita* 'looking down' in Sanskrit. It is difficult to determine the Tocharian form, but I suppose that the Toch. was /*ābhā-lokita-svara*/ because of the original Tocharian phonology and Skt. '*v*' being written as '*w*' in Tocharian.

A diachronic development could be: ***ābhā-loka-svara*** (Chin. 光世音 *Guāng shì yīn*) according to Dharmarakṣa → Toch. **_apa_** ('*bh*'→'*p*')-*lokita* (from '*āloka*'?)-*svara* (4–5th cc. based on Toch. paleographical analysis)[42] → **_avalokita-loka-svara_** (Chin. 觀世音, *Guānshìyīn*), according to Kumārajīva, who might have been familiar with Toch. '*avalokita-svara*', because he came from Kizil, and also he knew '*loka*' in Dharmarakṣa's version and presumably used it in his translation. Another possibility is to see '*avabhā-loka*' → '*avāloka*' → '*avalokita*'. Anyway '*bh*' and '*v*' were confused, as Karashima mentions: "We find an example which suggests that the translator confused -v- and -bh-: Z 63a3 光 (ābhā) 世 (loka) / K34 Avalokiteśvara (v.l. Avaloki-tasvara). The alternation of -bh- / -v- is common in Gāndhārī, but it is seen also in Pāli saṃvidā / saṃbhidā: not only a confusion between meanings, but also a phonetic (or writing) confusion".[43]

Moreover, as for -bh- and -v- in '*Ābhālokasvara*' (Chin. 光世音, *Guāng shì yīn*) in Dharmarakṣa's "Lotus Sūtra", when the original language was so-called Gāndhārī or some Prākrit in Northern India, *ābhā-* 'light' could be written instead of *ava-*,[44] but according to Brough,[44] -bh- was written as *bh, vh, v, h* in Gāndhārī, i.e. -v- could not be Gandh. -bh-, and moreover -sv- appeared as -sv-, -s- (not -śp-) in Gandh., and -śv- is represented by *śv, śp* and *ś* in Gandh. Therefore, *ābhâlokasvara* would be the original, and -bh- changed to -p- in Toch., then to -va-, as showed above. Another possibility: Toch. -p- was from -b- which was from -v-. In this case, this could show that -ava- was the original, and Dharmarakṣa could have seen *avabhā-*.

[41] Mizuno 2005: 31.
[42] Tamai 2011: 372.
[43] Karashima 1992: 268.
[44] Brough 1962: 96–97.

The translated Chinese word 大自在天, *dàzìzàitiān* for '*Maheśvara*' by Kumārajīva was used instead of the name of Indra and other Indian gods with supernatural power in his 'Lotus Sūtra' translation, and the Bodhisattva appeared as *Īśvara* or *Maheśvara* in order to rescue and enlighten laymen. One example of Kumārajīva's free translation: 復聞，諸佛有**大自在**神通之力 ("<…> again it is heard that every Buddha has supernatural power of the ***maheśvara***")[45] which corresponds to Skt. *vṛṣabha-tā*.

Xuánzàng mentioned in his "Great Tang Records on the Western Regions" (大唐西域記, *Dà táng xīyù jì*) as follows:

大唐西域記卷第三 八國 三藏法師玄奘奉 詔譯 烏仗那國鉢露羅國 (Butkara?)

有 **阿 縛 盧 枳 低 濕 伐 羅** 菩 薩 像 唐 言 觀 自 在 。 合 字 連 聲 。 梵 語 (T2087_51.0883b23)上。分文散音。即阿縛盧枳多。譯曰觀。伊濕伐羅。 譯曰自在。舊譯爲光世音。或云觀世音。或觀世自在皆訛謬也。"There is a statue of **Avalokiteśvara** which is called by a useless (or 'unclear'? for 唐) word 觀自在 'looking at will'. <e> is Sandhi of /ă̄/ + /ī/ in Skt. i.e. Avalokita is translated as 'looking', Īśvara as 'freely, at will'. Formerly it was translated as 'light-world-sound' or 'looking world-sound' or 'looking-world-at will', all are mistakes".[46]

Xuánzàng used 観自在 *Guānzìzài* (*Avalokiteśvara*), although he knew 光世音 *Guāngshìyīn* and 觀世音 *Guānshìyīn*. It could mean that Xuánzàng took the new name *Īśvara* instead of *svara* because of Kumārajīva's *Maheśvara* (Chin. 大自在, *Dàzìzài*) in order to follow the new conception which fitted well his time, as *Īśvara* prevailed in the Serindia area after a long cultural history in India (see the next section). Nevertheless, 觀(世)音, *Guān(shì)yīn* ('[One, who] Looking at the sound') is very popular in China and Japan. Thereafter, Avalokiteśvara faith with Tantrism became very popular. Thus, *Kāraṇḍavyūhasūtra*, extolling the virtues and powers of Avalokiteśvara, was compiled at the end of the 4th century or beginning of the 5th c. It introduces the mantra *Om maṇi padme hūm* and also teaches the important *Cundi dhāraṇī*, recitation of which causes a pore in Avalokiteśvara's body to open and reveal in brilliant illumination a vast multitude of world systems. This sūtra probably originated in Kashmir, since it has similarities with Kashmiri tantric traditions of the time and with *Avataṁsakasūtra* earlier associated with Central Asian regions.

[45] My translation for T0262_.09.0027b19-20.
[46] My translation.

As for the change /avāloka/ → /avalokita/, which I take from the meaning 'looking' (Chin. 観 *guān*), I will try to find other possibilities: /lokita/ is not the past part. (pass.) of √lok 'to look' + *-ita*, but *lokī* (nom. of *lokin* 'possessing a world') + *-tā* (abstract suffix) or *lokya* 'conducive to the attainment of a better world' + *-tā* (abstract suffix). /ī/ or /ya/ could become /i/, when these syllables are not accented, e.g. there was no /ī/, and /i/ was written as <yä> (unaccented) in Tocharian.

Karashima had mentioned that there was a confusion between /svara/ and /smara/ in Gāndhārī,[47] but he had hesitated to claim that the meaning of /svara/ changed from confused '念 thinking' and '声 voice' to the original '声 voice'.[48] There is no example of /svara/ and /smara/, nor /sma-/ in Gāndhārī. According to Brough, m/v is rare in Gāndhārī, but the Dharmapada shows a clear preference for *-m-* in place of *-v-* (including original /-p-/; cf. § 36), and Skt. (*sm*) to *sv* was not normally attested, but shows the assimilated form, e.g. *sadaṇa* for Skt. *smṛta* 340 or *sacita* for Skt. *svacitta* in Gāndh. Dharmapada, or the historical spelling *-sm-*, as in *vanasma* for P. loc. *-smiṃ*, *svadi* for Skt. *smṛti*; § 53).[49] Therefore, a linguistic confusion between *smara* and *svara* did not happen, but the translators were confused because of diachronic and synchronic changes.

A problem is *avalokitā*. It is not the adj. form of past part. passive (in the case of transitive verb), because the past part. passive shows a completion or state as its result. Judging from the compound form *avalokitêśvara*, *avalokita* would be a nominalized participle with active function, or a noun with abstract suffix /-tā/ which is a nom. form of /-tṛ/. Here *pāram-itā* is feminine of nominalized part. because of the fem. form of its predicate. The compound /ābhā-loka-svara/ is a Bahuvrīhi 'man of possessing light, world and sound' and /avalokiteśvara/ is appositional Karmadhāraya '(clearly) looking īśvara'. Another possibility of /avalokiteśvara/ is the binomen 'dominator-īśvara', as is in B-Tocharian /pud-ñäkte/ 'Buddha-God' and A-Tocharian /puttiśpar/ 'Buddha-īśvara(?)' used to make the word semantically clear.

The well-known word *olo'iśpare* in *dhamitrasa olo'iśpare danamukhe budhamitrasa amidahe*,[50] together with its sculpture, is a fake, in my opinion. Evidence is as follows:

---

[47] WATANABE 2018: 133; HARADA 2010: 31.
[48] KARASHIMA 1999: 61.
[49] BROUGH 1962: 102.
[50] BROUGH 1982; SALOMON & SCHOPEN 2002.

1) Palaeography: The first akṣara <bu> is not written, although there is enough space for two akṣaras (see next *budha-*); <mu> in <danamukhe> is not precise (see other <m>); the second <budhamitrasa> is surplus (or no space for <danamukhe>); <mi> or <mṛ> is an unknown akṣara (similar form can be found in the "Indoskript" online database made by H. Falk, but it is quite uncertain), <śp> cannot be found in the "Indoskript" until the 3rd century, suggesting that this inscription was written after the 4th c., although other akṣaras show 3rd c. forms. I see the penmanship as typical fake writing (Prof. Nasim Khan's opinion is the same, Internet communication on Dec. 26, 2023).

2) Phonology and grammar: *olo'iśpare* is a hapax legomenon, which is dangerous to accept as a proper word. Gāndh. /olo/ from Skt. /avalo/ is not attested, although /o/ for Skt. /ava/ is common in Gāndhārī and other Prākrits. No document including *ologispara* and *ologemana*, which are speculated by the author(s) of "A Dictionary of Gāndhārī", is mentioned. According to "A Dictionary of Gāndhārī", *ologemana* is written as *avaloyayamaṇa* (Skt. avaloka-yāman??) in Split Collection 2, site B line 20, but this is uncertain.

/kita/ of /avalokita/ could not disappear, it should have remained as /'iδa/, because /i/ of *īśpare* could not be deleted. Moreover, I cannot understand the cases of the ending <-e> of *olo'iśpare* and *amidahe* (*danamukhe* 'gift' is nom.). The dative is better in this context, but it could be *olo'iśparae* and *amidahae*. According to "A Dictionary of Gāndhārī" *olo'iśpare* is loc. which is cited from the research of Salomon and Schopen (with <?>),[51] but it is also uncertain. It should be the nom. sg. m. in my opinion.

3) Iconography: The head with wavy hair of *Amitahe* is old-fashioned, but it is mismatched with newer style of the face, the revealed right shoulder and a sole of the foot on his thigh. He is not sitting on the lotus directly. What is depicted between the Buddha and the lotus? If the small monk with a hand that seems too big is *Budhamitra*, as suggested by the name of donor engraved under him, its figure cannot be depicted, because *Budhamitra* is a donor of this sculpture. Then who is he? The statue *olo'iśpare* sits on a cane chair under a canopy with curious flowers or fruits, but his foot is on a lotus pedestal, and his position is higher than that of the Buddha, which is impossible in the Buddhist thought. The statue *olo'iśpare* has a lotus between his fingers (but which fingers?). According to C. Bautze-Picron, the lotus is the major attribute of Avalokiteśvara. It becomes, however, a permanent element only after the 5th c.[52] Early images from the Northwest and Mathurā, or from the 5th c. at Ajanta, do not necessarily intro-

[51] SALOMON & SCHOPEN 2002: 27.
[52] BAUTZE-PICRON 2004: 233–234.

duce the flower, and in Gāndhāra he can hold a wreath. The depiction of lotus here is not suitable for a sculpture made in the 2nd–3rd cc.

The name *Avalokiteśvara* is not attested in Gāndhāra. Amitābhā or Amitāyus did not exist in Gāndhāra, as Prof. Rhi Juhyung stated in 2022 at the Met Museum in the USA (he kindly sent me the video). Therefore, we should not trust the word *olo'iśpare*.

It is possible to see /īśvara/ as a confusion with /svara/ because of their phonetic similarity, and the word /īśvara/ became popular because of the prevalence of the *Īśvara*-belief together with *Dhāraṇī* in Serindia. We can see the name of *Īśvara* in Tocharian documents (see below), and its paintings can be seen in Khotan and China as Susan Whitfield commented in 1985 on the votive panel No. 1907, 1111.71 in the British Museum (on the Internet: "Curator's comment" at https://www.britishmuseum.org/collection/object/A_1907-1111-71):

"The triple-headed deity (from Dandan-oilik), with one fierce grotesque head and one feminine or benign one, is ithyphallic and holds the sun and moon, a vajra and another object. He has been identified by Joanna Williams[53] as Maheśvara, the name by which Śiva appears in Khotanese texts. As such he is seated on the vehicle of Śiva, the bull Nandin. Śiva's presence at Khotan shows the influence of tantric Buddhism and Śaivism from India: forms of Siva, which reached both Yungang (Cave 8, Northern Wei, late fifth century A.D.) and Dunhuang (Cave 285, Western Wei, early sixth century A.D.) are referred to by Williams. In the case of Cave 285, he is shown with three heads and six arms, holding aloft the sun and moon discs and seated on a blue bull. The early date at which these Śiva images made their appearance in China might lead one to question whether this image, and indeed the other wooden painted plaques from the Khotan area, may not also be dated nearer the sixth century than the eighth that is generally accepted (because of numerous finds of eighth-century Chinese coins) as the terminus ante quem for both the wall paintings and the votive plaques".[54]

3. On "*īśvara*"

Īśvara is composed from *īś*-, meaning in different contexts 'to be capable of' and 'owner, ruler', and the suffix *-vara*.[55]

---

[53] WILLIAMS 1973: 142–45.

[54] I cite Whitfield's comment on the internet: https://www.britishmuseum.org/collection/object/A_1907-1111-71

[55] DEBRUNNER 1954: 906.

I prefer to view *īś-* as a secondary Present of an old reduplicated Perfect[56] rather than Stative or Root-present Middle[57] because I see too few illustrations to set up one category Stative.

The second part *-vara* means, depending on context, 'best, excellent, beautiful', 'choice, wish, blessing, boon, gift', and 'suitor, lover, one who solicits a girl in marriage'. The word *īś-vara* means literally 'owner of best, beautiful', 'ruler of choices, blessings, boons', or 'chief suitor, lover'.

According to Amano, *īśvara* was used in *Maitrāyanī Saṃhitā* (900–700 BCE) together with gen./abl.-infinitive meaning 'to be able or fear to do (in negative sense)'.[58] The meaning 'president, leader' can be seen in Atharvaveda, and *lokeśvará* means "Ātman" (Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa 14.7.2).

The word *Īśvara* does not appear in the Ṛgveda, but the verb *īś-* does (absent in Sāmaveda, rare in Atharvaveda). It appears in Saṃhitas of Yajurveda with contextual meaning neither God nor supreme being, as the ancient Indian grammarian Pāṇini explains: *yasmād adhikaṃ yasya ceśvaravacanam …|* "to which (*yásmāt*) there is an excess (*ádhikam*) and about which (*yásya*) **rulership** is stated (*īśvara-vácanam*), <…>" (*Aṣṭādhyāyī* 2.3.9).

The word *Īśvara* appears in numerous ancient Dharmasūtras (600–200 BCE), in which it could not mean 'God', but means 'Veda', or could alternatively mean 'king', with the context literally asserting that the Dharmasūtras are as important as *Īśvara* (the king) on matters of public importance.

The term is used as part of the compounds *Maheśvara* ('The Great Lord') and *Parameśvara* 'The Supreme Lord', the names of Viṣṇu and Śiva. In Mahāyāna Buddhism it is used as part of the compound 'Avalokite**śvara**', who was a Bodhisatva revered because of his compassion. When referring to the divine as a female, particularly in Śaktism, the feminine *Īśvari* is sometimes used.

In the Advaita Vedānta school, *Īśvara* is a monistic Universal Absolute which connects to the Oneness in everyone and everything.

Yoga, Vaiśeṣika, Vedānta and Nyāya schools of Hinduism discuss *Īśvara*, but assign different meanings to it. *Īśvara* is a metaphysical concept in the Yogasūtras of Patañjali, in which *Īśvara* is mentioned not as a deity, nor as any devotional practices (*bhakti*), nor as *īśvara*-characteristics typically associated with a deity. In the Yoga school of Hinduism, *Īśvara* is neither a

---

[56] MAYRHOFER 1992: 207.
[57] GOTŌ 1997: 184–185.
[58] Prof. Amano at the Kyoto University kindly gave me her personal suggestion.

creator God nor the universal Absolute of the Advaita Vedānta school of Hinduism. In Śaivism, *īśvara* is an epithet of Śiva. In Vaiṣṇavism, it is synonymous with Viṣṇu. As a concept, *īśvara* in ancient and medieval Sanskrit texts variously means God, Supreme Being, Supreme Self, Śiva, a king or a ruler, a husband, the god of love, one of the Rudras and the number 'eleven'. Śiva in Hinduism was based on the Veda and, mixed with Āryan culture and native faith, was also called *Naṭarāja* 'dancing God'.[59]

In *Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad* (300–200 BCE), the ruler was the only one God called Maheśvara, and also Rudra, Śiva, who created the entire cosmos with phantom power *māyā*.[60] After late Upaniṣad (*Maitrāyaṇiya-Upaniṣad* 200 CE), many Upaniṣadas were produced, and we can find Upaniṣad which shows the Śiva-God worship in the teaching of six kinds of Yoga.[61] In the epic poetry like Mahābhārata, Trimūrti (three great Gods, Brahmā, Viṣṇu and Śiva) were especially worshiped.[62]

We can recognize the great Bodhisattva Avalokiteśvara (Lokeśvara) as a kind of supreme lord of the cosmos and as the progenitor of various heavenly bodies and divinities, such as the Sun and Moon, the deities Śiva and Viṣṇu.[63]

Īśvara prevailed so strongly synchronically and diachronically in India that it exerted a great influence on Serindia (Gāndhāra and Central Asia) together with Brahmanism and Buddhism. We can find *iśpara* as the title of the king Seṇavarma in the gold relic inscription of Seṇavarma, king of Oḍi,[64] in some recently excavated statues made from white marble in the Greater Gāndhāra (I found it in Pakistan, and Prof. Yokochi suggested that it might exist in Afghanistan), and even in B-Tocharian we can find *īśvara* in the name *īśvara-datte*, and 36 instances of *putt-iśpar* 'Buddha-Īśvara' → 'Buddhawürde' in A-Tocharian.[65]

Conclusion

The Hōryūji Manuscript is very important, not only for investigating Buddhism in the Serindian area, but also for Indian religious history. It shows

---

[59] NAKAMURA 1956: 82–83.
[60] NAKAMURA 1956: 85.
[61] NAKAMURA 1956: 100.
[62] NAKAMURA 1956: 102.
[63] NAKAMURA 1956: 139–140.
[64] BAUMS 2022: 18.
[65] TAMAI 2017: 257.

a mixture of Śaivism and Tantric Buddhism with phonological influence of the languages in Serindia, especially of Tocharian, when we observe writing mistakes and the typical Tocharian characters <ḷ> and <lla> in the Akṣara list.

Judging from the half size with two string holes (normal for large mss.) and no folio numbers, the Hōryūji Manuscript was likely portable for reciting at any time and place.

The name of the main subject of the Hōryūji Manuscript, *Avalokiteśvara*, shows a development from a compound /ābhālokasvara/ or /avabhālokasvara/ 'brilliant world sound', i.e. /ābhā/ 'light' or /avabhā/ 'sheen' became /ava-/ judging from Toch. /apa/; /-ā/ of the preceding /ābhā/ with /loka/ became /āloka/ 'looking' and further /lokita/ due to Skt. sandhi /-a/ + /ī-/ → /-e-/ as a sanscritization for higher prestige instead of /avalokita-īśvara/ without sandhi in Serindia; /svara/ changed to /īśvara/ because of phonetical similarity and also because of prevailing *īśvara* faith. If this hypothesis is correct, the Hōryūji Manuscript was written in Serindia.

References

"A Dictionary of Gāndhārī" by Baums/Glass: https://gandhari.org/main/plugins/corpus/ "Indoskript" by Falk/Hellwig: http://www.indoskript.org.

BAUMS, Stefan 2022: "The Earliest Colophons in the Buddhist Northwest". *The Syntax of Colophons: A Comparative Study across Pothi Manuscripts*. N. Balbir, G. Ciotti (eds.) 27: 15–41. Berlin; Boston: De Gruyter.

BAUTZE-PICRON, Claudine 2004: "The universal compassionate Bodhisattva Miscellaneous Aspects of Avalokitasvara/Avalokiteśvara in India". *Silk Road Art and Archaeology* 10: 225–290. Kamakura: The Institute of Silk Road Studies.

BAILEY Harold W. 1979: *Dictionary of Khotan Saka*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

BOYER, Auguste M. & RAPSON, Edward James & SENART Émile (eds.) 1920: *Kharoṣṭhī Inscription discovered by Aurel Stein in Chinese Turkestan*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

BROUGH, John 1962: *The Gāndhārī Dharmapada*. London: Oxford University Press.

BROUGH, John 1982: "Amitabha and Avalokiteśvara in an inscribed Gandharan sculpture". *Indologica Taurinensia* X: 65–70. Torino.

DEBRUNNER, Albert 1954: *Altindische Grammatik II, 2. Die Nominalsuffixe*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

GOTŌ Toshifumi 1997: „Überlegungen zum urindogermanischen Stativ". In: *Berthold Delbrück y la sintaxis indoeuropea hoy. Actas del coloquio de la Indogermanische Gesellschaft*. ed. E. Crespo and J.L. García Ramón. Madrid; Wiesbaden: Reichert: 165–192.

HARADA, Wasō. 原田和宗 2010: *"Hannyashinkyō" seiritsu shiron – daijō bukkyō to mikkyō no kōsaten*『般若心経』成立史論－大乗仏教と密教の交差点 [The History of the Creation of the 'Heart Sutra' — The Crossroads of Mahayana Buddhism and Esoteric Buddhism]. Tokyo 東京: Daizō Publishing 大蔵出版.

HOKAZONO, Kōichi 外園幸一 1994: *Raritabisutara no kenkyū* ラリタビスタラの研究 [The study of Lalitavistara]. Vol. 1. Tokyo 東京: Daitō Publishing 大東出版社.

IKUMA, Hiromitsu 伊久間洋光 2019: *Nyorai himitsukyō no kenkyū* 如来秘密経の研究 [Studies of the Tathāgataguhyasūtra]. Dissertation 博士論文 11301 甲第 18827 号 東北大学. Tohoku University.

ITŌ Gikyō 伊藤義教 1979: *Zoroasutā kenkyū* ゾロアスター研究 [The Studies of Zoroaster]. Tokyo 東京: Iwanami shoten 岩波書店.

JIANG Zhongxin 蒋忠新 1997: *Lǔshùn bówùguǎn guǎncáng fànwén fǎhuájīng duànjiǎn* 旅順博物館蔵梵文法華経断簡 [Sanskrit Lotus Sutra Fragments from the Lüshun Museum Collection, Facsimile Edition and Romanized Text]. Lǔshùn 旅順: Lǔshùn Museum 旅順博物馆.

KARASHIMA Seishi 辛嶋静志 1992: *Hokekyō kan'yaku no kenkyū: Sansukuritto to Chibetto-go-ban ni terashite* 法華経漢訳の研究: サンスクリットとチベット語版に照らして [The Textual Study of the Chinese Version of the Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra in the light of the Sanskrit and Tibetan versions]. Bibliotheca indologica et buddhologica 3. Tokyo 東京: Sankibō.

KARASHIMA Seishi 辛嶋静志 1994: *Jō-agonkyō no gengo no kenkyū:* 長阿含経の原語の研究 [The Studies of the original language of the Dīrghanikāya]. Tokyo 東京: Hirakawa shuppansha 平河出版社.

KARASHIMA Seishi 辛嶋静志 1999: "法華経の文献学的研究（二）—観音 Avalokitasvara の語義解釈—". *Annual Report of The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University* II: 39–66. Tokyo: Soka University.

KARASHIMA Seishi 辛嶋静志 2015: "Who Composed the Mahāyāna Scriptures? – Mahāsāṃghikas and *Vaitulya* Scriptures". *Annual Report of The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University* XVIII: 113–162. Tokyo: Soka University.

KINO Kazuyoshi 紀野一義 & NAKAMURA Hajime 中村元 1960: *Hannya shinkyō Kongō-hannyakyō* 般若心経・金剛般若経 [Heart Sūtra, Diamond Sūtra]. Tokyo 東京 岩波文庫 small book from Iwanami shoten.

MATSUDA Kazunobu 松田和信 2010: "Chūō ajia no bukkyō shahon" 中央アジアの仏教写本 [Buddhist manuscripts from Central Asia]. *Shin Ajia bukkyō-shi* 新アジア仏教史 [New Asian Buddhist History] 5: 118–158. Tokyo 東京: Kōsei Publishing 佼成出版社.

MAYRHOFER, Manfred 1992: *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindo-arischen*. Bd. 1. Heidelberg: Carl Winter, Universitätsverlag.

MELZER Gudrun 2020: *An Arapacana Acrostic Poem in Gandhari, Bajaur Collection Kharoṣṭhī Fragment 5*. München.

MIRONOV, Nikolai D. 1927: "Buddhist Miscellanea". *The Journal of Royal Asiatic of Great Britain and Ireland* 59(2): 241–279. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

MIZUNO Kōgen 水野弘元 2005: *Zōho kaitei pāri-go jiten* 増補改定パーリ語辞典 [Revised and expanded Pāli Dictionary]. Tokyo 東京: Shunjūsha 春秋社.

MÜLLER, Friedrich Max & NANJIO, Bunyiu 1884: *The Ancient Palm-Leaves containing the Prajñâ-Pâramitâ Hridaya-Sûtra and the Ushṇîsha-Vijaya-Dhâraṇî*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

MURAKAMI Shinkan 村上真完 2019: "Shotō ni okeru Chitsū yaku no kannonkyō-rui ga imisuru mono" 初唐における智通訳の観音経類が意味するもの [The Meaning of the Kannon Sūtras Translated by Zhītōng in the Early Tang Dynasty]. In: *Tōhoku daigaku*

bungaku kenkyūka bungakubu ronshū 東北大学文学研究科文学部論集: Tōhoku University 東北大学: 170–212.

NAKAMURA Hajime 中村元 1956: *Indo shisō-shi* インド思想史 [History of Indian Thought]. Tokyo 東京: Iwanami Shoten 岩波書店.

ONO, Genmyō 1923: *Kendara no Bukkyō bijutu* 健駄邏の佛教美術 [Buddhist art of Gāndhāra] 東京・丙午出版社.

SAKUMA Ruriko 佐久間留理子 2021: "Kārandavyūha sūtora ni okeru rokujishingon to nyoi-hōju – syōchōsei to kudoku –" カーランダ・ヴューハ・スートラにおける六字真言と如意宝珠─象徴性と功徳─ [The Six-Syllable Formula and Wish-fulfilling Jewels in the Kāraṇḍavyūha-sūtra: Symbolism and Merits]. *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 印度學佛教學研究 [Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies] 69(2): 818–811. Tokyo 東京: Japanese Association of Indian and Buddhist Studies.

SALOMON Richard 1990: "New Evidence for a Gāndhārī Origin of the Arapacana Syllabary". *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 110(2): 255–273. Ann-Arbor: New Heaven.

SALOMON, Richard & SCHOPEN, Gregory 2002: "On an Alleged Reference to Amitabha in a Kharoṣṭhī Inscription on a Gandhāran Relief". *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 25(1–2): 3–31.

SASAKI Daiju 佐々木大樹 2009: "Butchōsonshōdarani gaikan" 仏頂尊勝陀羅尼概観 [Overview of the Dhāraṇī on Victory of Buddha's Crown]. *Gendai mikkyō* 現代密教 [Modern Esoteric Buddhism] 20: 211–234. Tokyo 東京: (Publishing house Chizandenpōin 智山伝法院).

SILK Jonathan Alan 2021: "The Heart Sūtra as Dhāraṇī". *Acta Asiatica. Bulletin of the Institute of Eastern Culture* 121: 99–125. Tokyo: The Tōhō Gakkai.

TAMAI Tatsushi 2011: *Paläographische Untersuchungen zum B-Tocharischen.* Insbruck.

TAMAI Tatsushi 2017: "The Tocharian Mūgapakkha-Jātaka". *Annual Report of The International Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University* XX: 251–275. Tokyo: Soka University.

TAMAI Tatsushi 2022: "The Buddhist Philology from Studies of Tocharian Manuscripts". *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 印度學佛教學研究 [Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies] 70(3): 1181–1184. Tokyo 東京.

UNEBE Toshiya 畝部俊也 2015: "Bonbun «Butchōsonshōdaranikyō» to shoyaku no taishō kenkyū" 梵文『仏頂尊勝陀羅尼経』と諸訳の対照研究 [Comparative study of Sanskrit text of "Sūtra on Dhāraṇī of the Buddha's Crown" and its translations]. In: *Nagoyadaigaku bungakubu kenkyū ronshū (tetsugaku)* 名古屋大学文学部研究論集（哲学）[Nagoya University Faculty of Letters Research Papers (Philosophy)]. Nagoya: 名古屋大学文学部 Nagoya University Faculty of Letters: 97–146.

WATANABE Shōgo 渡辺章悟 2018: *Hannyashinkyō — tekusuto shisō bunka* 般若心経─テクスト・思想・文化 [Heart Sutra: Text, Thought, and Culture]. Tokyo 東京: Daihōrin-kaku 大宝輪閣.

XU Ye 2021: "Fó (佛), Pwuche (仏体), and Hotoke (保止氣)". *Sungkyun Journal of East Asian Studies* 21(2): 237–253. Seoul: Sungkyunkwan University.

YAITA Hide'omi 矢板秀臣 2001: "Hōryūji baiyō "Hannyashinkyō" shahon ni tsuite no ichi-hōkoku" 法隆寺貝葉『般若心経』写本についての一報告 [A report on the Hōryū-ji Temple palm-leaf manuscript of the "Heart Sūtra"]. *Chizan gakuhō* 智山学報 [Journal of Chizan Studies] 50: 7–16. Tokyo 東京.

Yamamoto Shōichirō 山本匠一郎 2006: "Dainichikyō shosetsu no sho jimon ni tsuite" 大日経諸説の諸字門について [On the various syllabaries of the Mahāvairocana Sūtra]. *Chizan gakuho* 智山学報 [Journal of Chizan Studies] 55: 87–111. Tokyo 東京.

Ye Shaoyong. 2021: "A Preliminary Report on a Sanskrit Manuscript of the Tathāgatama-hākaruṇā-nirdeśa or Dhāraṇīśvararāja". *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyu* 印度學佛教學研究 [Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies] 69(3): 1054–1059.

Yoshida Yutaka 2009: "Buddhist Literature in Sogdian". In: Ronald E. Emmerick and Maria Macuch (eds.) *The Literature of Pre-Islamic Iran.* Companion Volume I to A History of Persian Literature: 288–329. New York: I.B. Taurus & Co.