IS THE *HEART SŪTRA* AN APOCRYPHAL TEXT?
— A RE-EXAMINATION*

AUTHOR **JI YUN**
TRANSLATOR **CHIN SHIH-FOONG**

1. Introduction

There are many versions of the *Heart Sūtra*《心经》. Lin Guang Ming 林光明 has collected 184 of these including: Chinese (50), Sanskrit (39), English (29), Japanese (39), Tibetan (6), Korean (7), Indonesian (1), Vietnamese (2), French (4), German (4), Russian (3), and one version each in Manchurian and Mongolian (林光明, 2004). Not mentioned by Lin are translations in Spanish, Portuguese, Italian and others. The widespread appeal of the *Heart Sūtra* is thus apparent. Also from its many commentarial and research works both past and present, the profound impact of the *Heart Sūtra* on the spiritual lives of East Asians (China, Korea, and Japan) is clear. (Ochiai Toshinori 落合俊典, 2011) Therefore the *Heart Sūtra* warrants our close attention.

---

[*] This translation is based on the article《心经》疑伪问题再研究 published in the *Fuyan Buddhist Studies*, No. 7, pp. 115-182 (2012), Fuyan Buddhist Institute. Translator's notes embedded in this translation are denoted [T: followed by small font text]. Post-publication corrections to the original article have been incorporated without being highlighted in most cases. In this translation "T" stands for the Taishō edition of the Chinese Buddhist canon《大正新脩大藏经》; "*name/title" denotes a reconstructed name or text title. For ease of reference, a trilingual Appendix of the *Heart Sūtra* in Sanskrit, Chinese and English has been added by the translator at the end of this work. Acknowledgement is due to Ken Su of Hsinchu, Taiwan, for his clarification on certain Taishō readings, and to the author for providing copies of Conze's cited works, and of course his authorization for this translation.

A few months ago in Oct 2011, I read in the *Shanghai Book Review* 上海书評 a short commentary by Xu Wen Kan 徐文堪 entitled '*Heart Sūtra*' *and 'Journey to the West'*《〈心经〉和〈西游记〉》, (Xu Wen Kan 徐文堪, 2011) which mentioned Jan Nattier's well-known article *The Heart Sūtra: A Chinese Apocryphal Text?* (Nattier, 1992) Xu's article reminded me of the shock I had when I first read Nattier's article many years ago. As is well-known, the writing style of Pāli or Sanskrit Buddhist texts is more repetitious whereas the Chinese style is relatively more succinct. When I first read the Sanskrit *Heart Sūtra* [T: the critical edition by Conze (Conze, 2000b)], I found it to be as concise as the Chinese version. But feeling my own scholarship limited, I could not get to the root of the matter. It was not until I read Nattier's article that all became at once clear. Therefore when I read Xu's article on this occasion it made special sense to me. But this article is only a brief book review and does not introduce the readers to Nattier's article in any detail. I therefore decided to translate Nattier's article to benefit the wider readers. Regrettably after the translation was done, my communication with her came to an unexpected end, and I was unable to have the translation published without her authorisation.

In the process, I found that comments on Nattier's article made in the Chinese circle were occasionally erroneous and needed clarification. Xu Wen Kan wrote: "the *Heart Sūtra* was originally formulated by extracting certain passages from the *Dapin bore*《大品般若》[T: i.e. T223, Kumārajīva's translation of the *Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikā-prajñāpāramitā*]. Mei Wei Heng 梅維恒 (Victor H. Mair) wrote: "the *Heart Sūtra* was excerpts copied almost verbatim from the much larger *Mohe boruo boluomi jing*《摩诃般若波罗蜜经》(梅維恒, 2004, p. 45)" [T: **Mahāprajñāpāramitā*, another name for T223, also the *Large Sūtra* mentioned below]. But in fact Nattier's view is that the so-called Kumārajīva version of the *Heart Sūtra* "is not the work of Kumārajīva himself, but an adaptation of his version of the *Large Sūtra*《大经》(or rather, an adaptation of the version of his *Large Sūtra* included in the *Dazhidu lun*《大智度

论》**Mahāprajñāpāramitopadeśa*) by a third party." (Nattier, 1992, p. 188)

In his article Xu also remarked that "the back-translator is Xuanzang himself" (while Mei cautiously avoided the issue of back-translator at all). Although Nattier suspected Xuanzang to be the back-translator, she also said this "cannot ... be definitively proven." (Nattier, 1992, p. 181) Here, I do not mean to criticize the two scholars who are my seniors and whom I always respected. Perhaps it was due to the restrictive format of a book review, or the fact that the topic was outside their main area of research, that they did not give Nattier's article their full appraisal.

Not only did Nattier's article raise the question of whether the *Heart Sūtra* is an apocryphal text, it also talked about many issues hitherto undiscussed. For example, her conjectures about the historical development of the Chinese *Heart Sūtra*; her dating of the Hōryūji temple 法隆寺 version of the *Heart Sūtra*; her comments on the Indian and Chinese criteria for determining scriptural authenticity and so on, all contain many noteworthy observations. Regrettably these have not been given the attention they deserve by Buddhists and academics in China in the twenty years since its publication. Even in the English academic world, only relatively unprofessional supporting or counter arguments have emerged (Pine, 2004, pp. 23-27). Thus I decided to write this article to present in detail Nattier's views, her main supporting arguments for her views, and the logic behind those arguments. I will also provide some comments on her research.

In addition, I intend to present the main findings of some researchers on issues regarding the authenticity of the *Heart Sūtra*. I will also show the impact and contributions these findings made to Nattier's studies. I will furthermore compare these findings with Nattier's, to illustrate the importance of methodology in Buddhist philological studies.

Following this I will continue my discussion by investigating some of the unresolved issues concerning the *Heart Sūtra*. I would take this opportunity to thank my two mentors: Professor Fang Guang Chang 方广錩, who shall remain my life-long spiritual mentor, and who, like a patient teacher giving systematic advice, had made densely dotted emendations to my first draft; and Mr Su Jin Kun 苏锦坤, who had supported without fail (and we always remain each other's most unreserved critic). Mr Su has always helped me source the references I need. He read through my finished first draft more than once with care and corrected many typographical errors as well as expressions that did not meet Taiwanese usage. He also made some very insightful inquiries into certain issues. All errors in this article are of course mine alone.

2. Nattier's Research with Comments

The first thing Nattier pointed out in her article is that although the *Heart Sūtra*, as a concise Buddhist text, is very popular among East Asian Buddhists, and has therefore been thoroughly investigated academically in various ways, all previous studies have one major flaw. On the one hand "overexposure to its content … has prevented modern scholars from undertaking a thorough re-evaluation" (Nattier, 1992, p. 154), while on the other hand, modern Buddhist researchers tend to either work with the Sanskrit version (and occasionally consulting the various Chinese texts), or work with the Chinese version (and more or less consulting the corresponding Sanskrit passages). In other words, there are many "intra-Sanskrit" and "intra-Chinese" studies but very little "cross-lingual" analyses (Nattier, 1992, p. 154). In this regard, Nattier's article is a stand-out due precisely to its innovative methodology, which has pointed a way forward for us in our future Buddhist research.

It is common knowledge that existing versions of the *Heart Sūtra* can generally be divided into a shorter form and a longer form. The former is considered to be earlier and is thus the focus of Nattier's article. For ease of narration, the article begins with an English translation of the Sanskrit *Heart Sūtra*. (Nattier, 1992, p. 155-156)

Immediately following the translation of the short-form *Heart Sūtra*, Nattier pointed out a few peculiar features of the text. First, compared with other Mahāyāna sutras, it is very brief. But immediately she also pointed out that "this feature is not, however, unique, as there are a few other Mahāyāna texts that are of comparable length, especially those found in the catalogues of Prajñāpāramitā sutras. Conze had labelled a whole group of such texts (in fact all composed relatively late) as " 'abbreviations' of earlier texts." (Conze, 2000a, pp. 56-74)

Then there are other more important peculiar features. First, the *Heart Sūtra* lacks an opening section usually associated with all Buddhist sutras (i.e. "Thus have I heard. At one time, the Lord was staying at…". (Brough, 1950) Second, it lacks a concluding section [T: remarks on the reaction of the audience]. Third, Buddha himself makes no appearance in the *sūtra*.

Fourth, in the context of Prajñāpāramitā literature, there is the unusual feature of having the *bodhisattva* Avalokiteśvara, who generally plays no role in this type of literature, as the main (and indeed only) preacher. (Donald S. Lopez, 1988, p. 7 n. 14) By contrast, there is the complete absence of Subhūti, the main interlocutor in the earliest Prajñāpāramitā texts. "The cast of characters, in other words, is not at all what we would expect, for both the Buddha himself and Subhūti are entirely missing, while a seeming interloper, the *bodhisattva* Avalokiteśvara, has been awarded the only speaking part." (Nattier, 1992, p. 157)

The fifth and final peculiar feature is that unlike earlier Prajñāpāramitā sutras, the *Heart Sūtra* ends with a mantra. Mantras play a relatively limited role in Prajñāpāramitā literature and when they first appear they are labelled "not as mantras but as *dhāraṇī*, a term referring (in this early usage) to mnemonic devices rather than inherently salvific or protective formulas." (Nattier, 1992, p.

158) Nattier explained that there is no instance of the use of mantras or *dhāraṇī* in what are generally considered to be the earliest Prajñāpāramitā texts, i.e. the *Ratnaguṇasaṁcayagāthā* (author's note: the extant Chinese translation is the *Foshuo fomu baodezang boruo poluomi jing*《佛说佛母宝德藏般若波罗蜜经》by Faxian 法賢 of Song), and the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā-prajñāpāramitā-sūtra*《八千颂般若经》. The first appearance of the mantra formulas in this body of literature occurs in the *Pañcaviṁśāhasrikā-prajñāpāramitā-sūtra*《二万五千颂般若经》. Although in later Buddhism mantra and *dhāraṇī* are not easily distinguishable, in early Buddhism, mantra referred to words or phrases in which the sounds themselves were considered to be highly effective when pronounced correctly, and *dhāraṇī* was first employed in reference to mnemonic devices used to retain (Sanskrit *dhṛ*, meaning 'to hold') certain elements of Buddhist doctrine in one's memory. (Nattier, 1992, p. 158 n. 9)

2.1 Two Astonishingly Similar Texts

Following the above discussion, Nattier pointed out two startling similarities — the word-for-word parallel: between the *Heart Sūtra* attributed to Xuanzang and the *Large Sūtra* translated by Kumārajīva, i.e. the **Mahāprajñāpāramitā* (T223), and between the Chinese *Heart Sūtra* attributed to Xuanzang and the Sanskrit *Heart Sūtra* in the the critical edition published by Edward Conze. (Nattier, 1992, p. 158-161) These similarities are illustrated by the two following tables:

Table 1

***Large Sūtra* Kumārajīva trans.** (T No.223, 8.223a13-20)	***Heart Sūtra* Xuanzang trans.** (T No.251, 8.848c4-10)
舍利弗	舍利子
色不异空　空不异色	色不异空　空不异色
色即是空　空即是色	色即是空　空即是色
受想行识　亦复如是	受想行识　亦复如是
舍利弗	舍利子
是诸法空相	是诸法空相
不生不灭	不生不灭
不垢不净	不垢不净
不增不减	不增不减
是空法非过去非未来非现在	——
是故空中无色无受无想行识	是故空中无色无受想行识
无眼耳鼻舌身意	无眼耳鼻舌身意
无色声香味触法	无色声香味触法
无眼界乃至无意识界	无眼界乃至无意识界
亦无无明亦无无明尽	无无明亦无无明尽
乃至亦无老死亦无老死尽	乃至无老死亦无老死尽
无苦集灭道	无苦集灭道
亦无智亦无得	无智亦无得

Table 2

Chinese *Heart Sūtra* (Nattier’s translation)	**Sanskrit *Heart Sūtra*** (Nattier’s translation)
Śāriputra,	Here, Śāriputra,
—	Form is empty, emptiness itself is form.[1]
Form is not different from emptiness,	Form is not distinct from emptiness,
emptiness is not different	emptiness is not distinct
from form.	from form.
Form itself is emptiness,	[That which is form is emptiness,
emptiness itself is form.	that which is emptiness is form.]
Śāriputra,	Here, Śāriputra,
All dharmas are marked by	All dharmas have the mark of
emptiness:	emptiness:[2]
[They are] not originated,	[They are] non-originated,
Not extinguished,	Non-extinct,
Not defiled,	Non-defiled,
Not pure,	Non-pure,

---

[1] Nattier’s note: This line, which is absent from all the Chinese versions of the text, appears in the form cited here (that is, Skt. *rūpaṁ śūnyaṁ śūnyataiva rūpaṁ*) in the majority of extant Sanskrit copies … as well as in the Tibetan translation of the longer recension of the *sūtra* (which reads *gzugs stong-pa'o*). Conze, however, preferred the reading “form is emptiness” (*rūpaṁ śūnyatā*) and accordingly chose this version (which constitutes a distinct minority of readings in the manuscript copies) as standard. (Nattier, 1992, n. 12)

[2] Nattier’s note: Here we come to a large rift between the traditional Chinese understanding of this line, on the one hand, and the Tibetan on the other. The Chinese *Heart Sūtra* reads *shih chu fak'ung hsiang* [T: 是诸法空相] “all dharmas [have] the mark [of] emptiness.” The Tibetan *Heart Sūtra*, by contrast, reads *chos thams-cad stong-pa-nyid-de/mtshan-nyid med-pa* (‘all dharmas are emptiness [they are] devoid of marks’). Grammatically the Sanskrit admits of either interpretation; it can be read either as *sarvadharmāḥ śūnyatā-lakṣaṇā* (“all dharmas have the mark of emptiness”) or as *sarvadharmāḥ śūnyatā-alakṣaṇā* (“all dharmas are emptiness, [and are] unmarked”) (author’s note: Sanskrit *sandhi* specifies that long *ā* vowel combined with short *ā* vowel becomes long *ā*, and the meaning of *lakṣaṇā* is negated by prefix ‘*ā*’). Conze's English translation of the Sanskrit follows the Chinese sense, but without a discussion of the alternative reading. (Nattier, 1992, n. 13)

Not increasing,	Non-decreasing,
Not decreasing.	Non-increasing.[3]
Therefore in emptiness there is	Therefore, Śāriputra, in emptiness there
no form, no sensation, no concept,	is no form, no sensation, no concept,
conditioning force, [or]	no conditioning forces, no
consciousness;	consciousness;
No eye, ear, nose, tongue, body [or]	No eye, ear, nose, tongue, body [or]
mind;	mind;
No form, sound, smell, taste,	No form, sound, smell, taste,
touch-object	touch-object
[or] mind-object (dharma);	[or] mind-object (dharma);
No eye-realm (and so on up to) no	No eye-realm (and so on up to) no
realm of mind-consciousness;	realm of mind-consciousness;
And no ignorance and no destruction	No ignorance, no destruction
of ignorance;	of ignorance;
(And so on up to) no old-age-and-death	(And so on up to) no old-age-and-death
[and] no destruction of	[and] no destruction of
old-age-and-death;	old-age-and-death;
There is no suffering, arising	There is no suffering, arising
[of suffering], extinction	[of suffering], extinction
[of suffering], [or] path;	[of suffering], [or] path;
No wisdom and no attainment.	No wisdom [and] no attainment.

---

[3] Nattier's note: It is noteworthy that both Sanskrit versions of this passage (that is, both the *Heart Sūtra* and the *Large Sūtra*) follow the sequence "not decreasing, not increasing," while both Chinese versions place the word "increasing" (zeng, 增) before "decreasing" (jian, 減). It is difficult to explain this reversal no matter what direction of textual transmission is postulated. A possible explanation is that that the difference is due simply to the established sequences of these terms in the two languages: that is, that in Sanskrit the more natural sequence would be "decreasing-increasing," while the reverse would be true in Chinese (just as in English we normally say "waxing and waning" rather than the reverse, and would tend to follow this sequence even when translating from a language that read "waning and waxing"). An additional factor may be the visual effect of the Chinese characters: by placing the word "decreasing" last, one obtains a sequence of six negations in which items 2, 4 and 6 all contain the "water" radical while items 1, 3 and 5 do not. If one followed instead the sequence found in the Sanskrit *Large Sūtra* the water radical would not alternate so rhythmically, but would instead appear in items 2, 4 and 5, lending a perhaps less poetic appearance to the list. Both of these suggestions are, however, merely hypothetical. (Nattier, 1992, n. 14)

2.2 One Astonishing Difference

If we consider the word-for-word correspondence between the Chinese *Heart Sūtra* and the Chinese *Large Sūtra* [T: Table 1] relatively easy to explain (as mutual copies), then the (literal) correspondence between the Chinese and Sanskrit versions of the *Heart Sūtra* [T: Table 2] is somewhat baffling (this point was noted by me many years ago). Even more peculiar is the startling difference between the Sanskrit *Large Sūtra* and the Sanskrit *Heart Sūtra* as pointed out by Nattier. Here the *Large Sūtra* is the *Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikā-prajñāpāramitā* transcribed from Gilgit manuscript, in which certain features of Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit[4] are clearly shown.

Sanskrit *Large Sūtra*	**Sanskrit *Heart Sūtra***
na hi Śāradvatīputra-[5] —— -anyad rūpaṁ anyā śūnyatā[6] nānya śūnyatānyad rūpaṁ [rū]paṁ eva śūnyatā	iha Śāriputra rūpaṁ śūnyaṁ śūnyataiva rūpaṁ rūpān na pṛthak śūnyatā śūnyatāya na pṛthag rūpaṁ [yad rūpaṁ sā śūnyatā

---

[4] Nattier's note: All citations from the Sanskrit *Large Sūtra* are based on the readings found in the Gilgit manuscript published in facsimile by Raghu Vira and Lokesh Chandra; a photocopy and transcription of the passage corresponding to the core section of the *Heart Sūtra* were generously supplied by Gregory Schopen. I have followed Schopen's lead in not regularizing the transcription. (Nattier, 1992, n. 15)

[5] Nattier's note: The Gilgit manuscript of the Sanskrit *Large Sūtra* regularly reads *Śāradvatīputra*, while the later Nepalese manuscripts (and the Tibetan translation) read *Śāriputra*. For a discussion of this and other variants of this name see Andre Migot, "*Un grand disciple du Buddha Śāriputra," Bulletin de l'école Francaise d'Extreme-Orient*, 56 (1954), 405-554 (p. 411). (Nattier, 1992, n. 16)

[6] Nattier's note: The Gilgit manuscript regularly reads *śunyatā* where *śūnyatā* is expected. (Nattier, 1992, n. 18)

śūnyat(ai)va rūpaṁ	ya śūnyatā tad rūpaṁ[10]]
evaṁ nā(ny)ā vedanānyā śūnyatā	——
nānya saṁjñā nānyā śūnyatā	——
nānye saṁskārā anye śūnyatā	evaṁ eva vedanā-saṁjñā-saṁskāra-
nānya vijñānaṁ anyā śūnyatā	vijñānaṁ
nānyaḥ śūnyatānyad vijñānaṁ	——
vijñānaṁ eva śūnyatā śūnyataiva	——
vijñānaṁ	——
ya Śāradvatīputra śūnyatā	iha Śāriputra sarva-dharmāḥ śūnyatā-
——	lakṣaṇā
na sā utpadyate	anutpannā
na nirudhyate	aniruddha
na saṁkliśyate	amalā
na vyavadāyate	avimalā
na hīyate	anūnā
na vardhate	aparipūrṇāḥ
nātītā nānāgatā na pratyutpannā[7]	——
yā notpadyate na nirudhyate na	——
saṁkliśyate na vyavadāyate na	——
hīyate na vardhate nātītā	——
nānāgatā na pratyupannāḥ	——
——	tasmāc Chāriputra śūnyatāyām na
na tatra rūpaṁ na vedanā na	rūpaṁ na vedanā
na saṁjñān na saṁskārān	na saṁjñā na saṁskārāḥ
na vijñānaṁ	na vijñānaṁ
na cakṣur na śrotraṁ na ghrāṇaṁ	na cakṣuḥ-rotra-ghrāṇajihvā-kāya-
na jihvā na kāye na manaḥ	manāṁsi
na rūpaṁ na śabdo na gandho na rasa	na rūpa-śabda-gandha-rasa-

---

[7] Nattier's note: This line ("not past, not future, [and] not present") is found in both the Gilgit manuscript and Dutt's late Nepalese copies of the *Large Sūtra*, as well as in the Chinese translations of the text. It is absent, however, from all versions of the *Heart Sūtra* (in all languages) except the Chinese version attributed to Kumārajīva, a text whose attribution is very problematic. More will be discussed below. (Nattier, 1992, n. 20)

[10] Nattier's note: "The sentences *yad rūpaṁ sā śūnyatā ya śūnyatā tad rūpaṁ* ("that which is form is emptiness, that which is emptiness is form") are absent from a substantial majority of the Sanskrit manuscripts reviewed by Conze in his critical edition, as well as from the canonical (longer version) Tibetan translation, though they do appear in the Tun-huang manuscript copies (shorter version), where they are rendered into Tibetan as *gag gzugs-pa de stong-pa-nyid//gag stong-pa-nyid-pa degzug-te* [sic]. Accordingly, I have omitted these lines from the English translation of the Sanskrit given above. (Nattier, 1992, n. 19)

Sanskrit *Large Sūtra*	Sanskrit *Heart Sūtra*
na sparśo na dharmāḥ	spraṣṭava[11]-dharmāḥ
——	——
na tatra skandhā na dhātavo	
nāyatanāni	na cakṣur[12]-dhātu yāvan
na tatra cakṣudhātu na rūpadhātu	
na cakṣuvijñānadhātu	
na (śro)tradhātu na śabdadhātur	
na śrotravijñānadhātuḥ	
na ghrāṇadhātu na gandhadhātur	
na ghrāṇavijñānadhātu	
na jihvadhātur na rasadhātur	
na jihvavijñāna dhātuḥ	
na kāyadhātur na spraṣṭavyadhātur	
na kāyavijñānadhātur	na mano vijñāna-dhātuḥ
na manodhātur na dharmadhātur	
na manovijñāna[dhā]tuḥr[sic]	nāvidyā nāvidyā-kṣayo
na tatrāvidyā nāvidyānirodhaḥ	
na saṁskārān na saṁskārānirodhaḥ	
na vijñānaṁ na vijñānanirodhaḥ	
na nāmarrūpaṁ na	
nāmarrūpanirodhaḥ	
na satvāyatanaṁ[8] na	
satvāyatananirodhaḥ	
na sparśo(na)sparśananirodhaḥ	
na vedanā na vedanānirodhaḥ	
na tṛṣṇā na tṛṣṇānirodhaḥna	
nopādānaṁ nopādānanirodhaḥ	
na bhavo na bhavanirodhaḥ	

---

[8] Nattier's note: "Where the Gilgit text reads *na satvāyatanaṁ na satvāyatananirodhaḥ* ("no being-*āyatanas* and no extinction of being-*āyatanas*"). Dutt's edition has *na ṣaḍāyatanā na ṣaḍāyatana-nirodha* ("no six *āyatanas* and no extinction of the six *āyatana*"), which is the more expected reading. (Nattier, 1992, n. 23)

[11] Nattier's note: Note that the *Heart Sūtra* reads *spraṣṭavya* while the *Large Sūtra* has *sparśa*. In this context (that is, in the list of *āyatana* and *dhātus*) the reading *spraṣṭavya* ("touchable") is more standard than *sparśa* ("touch"); see Bruce Hall, *Vasubandhu on "Aggregates, Spheres, and Components": Being Chapter One of the "Abhidharmakośa"*, Ph.D.thesis, Harvard Univ.,1983, p. 62 (I, §9a-b) and p. 80 (I, §14a-b). (Nattier, 1992, n. 21)

[12] Nattier's note: The *Heart Sūtra* regularly reads *cakṣurdhātu* where the *Large Sūtra* has *cakṣudhātu*. (Nattier, 1992, n. 22)

na jāti(r n)a jātinirodhaḥ jarāmaraṇaṁ na jarāmaraṇanirodhaḥ na duḥkhaṁ na samudayo na nirodho na mārgaḥ na prāpti nābhisamayaḥ[9]	yāvan na jarāmaraṇaṁ na jarāmaraṇakṣayo na duḥkha-samudaya-nirodha-mārga na jñānaṁ na prāpti

After comparing the two Sanskrit texts, we can easily conclude that they are different. First, the Sanskrit *Large Sūtra* is clearly longer than the Sanskrit *Heart Sūtra*. Although they basically have the same content, the latter is much more concise and has omitted certain category (of the five *skandhas*). For example, the *Large Sūtra* does not simply say: "form is not one thing and emptiness another (*na … anyad rūpaṁ anyā śūnyatā*), but goes on to repeat the same formula for each of the remaining four *skandhas* ("sensation is not one thing and emptiness another") and so on. The *Heart Sūtra*, by contrast, states simply that the same is true of the other *skandhas* as well (*evaṁ eva vedanā-saṁjñā-saṁskāra-vijñānaṁ*). Likewise when the *Large Sūtra* declares that in emptiness there is no eye, no ear, and so forth, it does so by enumerating each of the eighteen *dhātus* individually, while the *Heart Sūtra* simply lists the first twelve elements in the list (that is, the sense-organs and their respective objects) and then summarizes the remaining *dhātus* in abbreviated form ("no eye-realm and so forth up to no mind-consciousness-realm" Skt. *na cakṣur-dhātu yāvan na manovijñāna-dhātuḥ*)." (Nattier, 1992, p. 163)

More peculiarly, when expressing a similar idea, the two Sanskrit versions even resort to using different terms and expressions. For example, while both versions are saying “no old-age-and-death” (*na jarāmaraṇaṁ*), the *Large Sūtra* goes on to say there is no “extinction” (or “stopping”) (*nirodha*), whereas the *Heart Sūtra* uses the term *kṣaya* “destruction”. Another example is that the *Large Sūtra* uses the expression *na anya X anya Y* to express “form is not other than emptiness, emptiness is not other than form”, that is, “X is not other than Y” (literally “not other X other Y”) whereas the *Heart Sūtra* uses the expression “*X na pṛthak Y*” (literally “from-X not distinct Y,” in which X is in the ablative case). The two texts are essentially identical in meaning but differ noticeably in wording. (Nattier, 1992, p. 164)

---

[9] Nattier's note: While the Sanskrit *Large Sūtra* negates attainment (*prāpti*) and realization (*abhisamaya*), most Sanskrit manuscript copies of the *Heart Sūtra* place the term *prāpti* second rather than first and negate knowledge (*jñāna*) rather than realization. In this respect the Sanskrit *Heart Sūtra* matches both the Chinese *Heart Sūtra* attributed to Xuanzang and the Chinese *Large Sūtra* translation of Kumārajīva, where the corresponding terms are 智 and 得. (Nattier, 1992, n. 24)

Nattier cited yet another even more vivid example to show the divergence between the two texts as follows:

Large Sūtra	***Heart Sūtra***
na … utpadyate	*anutpannā*
na nirudhyate	*aniruddhā*
na saṁkliśyate	*amalā*
na vyavadāyate	*avimalā*
na hīyate	*anūnā*
na vardhate	*aparipūrṇ.0ā*

In this example, the *Large Sūtra* consistently uses the singular verbal forms:

> [It] does not originate (*na ... utpadyate*), is not extinguished (*na nirudhyate*), is not defiled (*na saṁkliśyate*), is not purified (*na vyavadāyate*), does not decrease (*na hīyate*), does not increase (*na vardhate*);

By contrast, the *Heart Sūtra* uses plural adjectival forms:

> [They] are non-originated (*anutpannā*), non-extinct (*aniruddhā*), non-defiled (*amalā*), non-pure (*avimalā*), non-decreasing (*anūnā*), non-increasing (*aparipurṇā*).

It can be seen from the above comparisons that there are substantial differences between the two Sanskrit versions, not only in their terminology but also in their grammatical forms (verbs vs. adjectives, singulars vs. plurals).

More importantly, these grammatical differences in numbers fit in with Nattier's overall scheme (of textual transmission). For example, the shift from singular forms (in the *Large Sūtra*) to plurals (in the *Heart Sūtra*) is paralleled by a change of subject in the Sanskrit texts – from "emptiness" (in the *Large Sūtra*) to "all dharmas" (in the *Heart Sūtra*). In other words, while the Sanskrit *Large Sūtra* reads "that which is emptiness does not originate" and so on, Kumārajīva's Chinese *Large Sūtra* reads "all dharmas are marked by emptiness: not originated" and so on, wordings which the *Heart Sūtra* attributed to Xuanzang follow exactly. But since the subject in Xuanzang text is only implied, the readers would be led into thinking that the subject is "all dharmas", which most interestingly conincided with the plural form of "emptiness" in the Sanskrit *Heart Sūtra*. From the above discussion one can observe the trail of transmission from the Sanskrit *Large Sūtra* > to the Chinese *Heart Sūtra* > to the Sanskrit *Heart Sūtra*. (Nattier, 1992, n. 26)

Furthermore, in terms of Sanskrit, there are close parallels between the *Large Sūtra* and the *Heart Sūtra*. Although they differ in terminology and grammatical forms, they share clear similarity in content. What then is the relationship between the two texts? First in terms of textual history, the *Large Sūtra* clearly predates the *Heart Sūtra*. There is an abridged translation of the the *Large Sūtra* dated 286 CE by Dharmarakṣa 竺法护 — the *Guang zhan jing*《光赞经》(T222), and a complete translation of it dated 291 CE by Mokṣala 无叉罗 — the *Fang guang jing*《放光经》(T221). However, the so-called Kumārajīva *Heart Sūtra* (if this is indeed his work) would have be done around 402-412 CE, while the Xuanzang *Heart Sūtra* is said to be translated in 649 CE. Clearly both are later than the *Large Sūtra*. Thus, we can only conclude that the word-for-word correspondence between the Kumārajīva *Large Sūtra* and the

Xuanzang *Heart Sūtra* can only be the result of the latter inheriting or copying from the former. Such analysis however does not apply to the Sanskrit *Large Sūtra* and the Sanskrit *Heart Sūtra*. This is because although the two texts have closely matching views and even matching orders of presentation of these views, they have used different terms. There is the substitution of adjectvies for verbs, plurals for singulars, and synonymous Buddhist terms (e.g. *kṣaya* for *nirodha*). All these examples illustrate that as a general philological redaction rule, the Sanskrit *Heart Sūtra* is unable to be derived from the Sanskrit *Large Sūtra*, nor *vice versa*.

Therefore, in the subsequent sections, Nattier re-analysed the entire path of transmission of the various texts. She began by comparing the Sanskrit *Large Sūtra* with Kumārajīva's Chinese of this text. She found the two to be closely correlated apart from the changes for meeting the Chinese aesthetic preference for succinctness. Therefore the line of transmission from the Sanskrit *Large Sūtra* to the Chinese *Large Sūtra* is very clear-cut. And given the similarities mentioned earlier between the Chinese *Large Sūtra* and the Xuanzang Chinese *Heart Sūtra* — plus the fact that the former appeared much earlier than the latter, the line of transmission of the corresponding content from the Chinese *Large Sūtra* to the Chinese *Heart Sūtra* is also very clear-cut. But how is the Sanskrit *Heart Sūtra* to be placed in this line of transmission? Nattier's answer to this is: "the Sanskrit *Heart Sūtra* is a translation from the Chinese (*Heart Sūtra*)." (Nattier, 1992, p. 169)

2.3 Internal Evidence: How to Determine a Back-Translation

Nattier's first task is to resolve a methodological issue, namely, how to determine a case of back-translation. For this, she made use of her background in Mongolian studies. In other words, citing examples of back-translation in the Mongolian Buddhist canon she unravelled the general indicators and features of a back-translation. She pointed out that the Mongols were fond of Indian loan words, but their *Kanjur* and *Ganggyur* were translated from the Tibetan Buddhist canon which has a preference for free translation. Thus, the Mongols were compelled to find a way of translating the Tibetan terms, which have been freely translated from Sanskrit, back into their Sanskrit terms which may or may not be correct. For example, in the *Ārya-maitrī-sūtra*, the city of abode for Maitreya is Ketumatī in Sanskrit literature (author's note: "Jitou city" 鸡头城 in Chinese transliteration), often translated into Tibetan as *Rgyal-mtshan blo-gros*, where *rgyal-mtshan* (lit."royal ensign") is a Tibetan translation of Sanskrit *ketu* "flag," and *blo-gros* ("mind") is an attempted rendition of the suffix *matī* [T: feminine form of *-mat* meaning "having, possessed of"]. This in fact is a mistranslation (Nattier, 1992, p. 170, n. 35) but we can ignore (its details) here as it is irrelevant to our present discussion. However, the Mongolian translators attempted to recover the original Indian word for *Rgyal-mtshan blo-gros* and reconstructed the first element in the name not as *ketu*, but as *dhvaja* — another Sanskrit word for "flag" that is also regularly rendered into Tibetan as *rgyal-mtshan*. In other words, the Mongols made an educated but erroneous guess using in all probability a Tibetan-to-Sanskrit dictionary as their reference. (Nattier, 1992, p. 170)[13]

Nattier thus concluded that: "An unmatched but synonymous equivalent of a Sanskrit term, then, is one of the leading indicators of back-translation. But there are other indicators as well. Incorrect word order, grammatical errors that can be traced to the structure of the intermediary language, and incorrect readings (due to visual confusion of certain letters or characters in the intermediary language) can all provide evidence that reconstruction, not preservation of an original text, has taken place." (Nattier, 1992, p. 170)

---

[13] Nattier's note: The various Mongolian-Tibetan-Sanskrit dictionaries employed by the Mongols in translating Buddhist texts from the Tibetan are discussed in detail in Vladimir Leonidovich Uspensky, "*Buddiiskaya terminologiya v mongol'skom perevode. Isiochniki dlya izucheniya i puti formirovaniya*" [*"Buddhist Terminology in Mongolian Translation. Sources for their Study and their Means of Formation"*] (unpublished M.A. thesis, Leningrad University, 1981), pp. 8-27. One of the most important of these texts is the Mongolian version of the Tibetan-Sanskrit dictionary known as the *Mahāvyutpatti*; see Alice Sarkozi, "*Some Words on the Mongolian Mahāvyutpatti*" Acta Orientalia (Budapest), vol. 34 (1980), pp. 219-234. (Nattier, 1992, n. 36)

By this criterion we can see that the *Heart Sūtra* shows similar signs (of back-translation). For example, where we read *na anyad rūpaṁ anyā śūnyatā* in the Sanskrit *Large Sūtra* ("form is not one thing and emptiness another"), meaning of course "form is not different from emptiness" (色不异於空), the Xuanzang *Heart Sūtra* reads: "*se bu yi kong*" (色不异空), which interestingly is the exact Sanskrit *Heart Sūtra* reading of "*rūpān na pṛthak śūnyatā*". Here, Nattier's explanation is somewhat complicated but we can explain it as follows: If we disregard gender, number, case and other grammatical forms and focus solely on the word orders, we can see that the four words in the Sanskrit *Heart Sūtra* are the exact match of the four Chinese words "*se bu yi kong*". In Nattier's own words, it is "a perfectly good (if somewhat unidiomatic) translation of Chinese "*se bu yi kong*". And this is also "an exact counterpart of the sequence Skt. *ketu* > Tib. *rgyal-mtshan* > Skt. *dhvaja*, in which a Sanskrit term is transformed — via back-translation through a second-language intermediary — into a synonymous but quite different expression." (Nattier 1992, p. 171) [T: i.e. Skt. *na anyad rūpaṁ anyā śūnyatā* > Ch. *se bu yi kong > Skt. rūpān na pṛthak śūnyatā*]

Nattier provided a second example (of back-translation). Where the Sanskrit *Large Sūtra* reads *na jarāmaraṇanirodhaḥ* "no extinction (*nirodha*) of old-age-and-death", the Sanskrit *Heart Sūtra* has *na jarāmaraṇakṣayo* "no destruction (*kṣaya*) of old-age-and-death." And the term *nirodha* in the Sanskrit *Large Sūtra* has been replaced in both the Chinese *Large Sūtra* and the Chinese *Heart Sūtra* by the term *jin* (尽), which is back-translated to *kṣaya* in the Sanskrit *Heart Sūtra* [T: Skt. LS *nirodha* > Ch. LS & HS *jin* > Skt. HS *kṣaya*].

A more striking example (of back-translation) is the following parallel readings:

Sanskrit Large Sūtra	*Chinese Large Sūtra*	*Sanskrit Heart Sūtra*
na … utpadyate	不生	*anutpannā*
na nirudhyate	不灭	*aniruddha*
na saṁkliśyate	不垢	*amalā*

na vyavadāyate	不淨	*avimalā*
na hīyate	不增	*anūnā*
na vardhate	不減	*aparipūrṇā*

For expressing the same meaning the Sanskrit *Large Sūtra* uses singular verbal forms, while the Sanskrit *Heart Sūtra* uses plural adjectives. Nattier's explanation for this is again somewhat hard to follow, but my own understanding is this: The expressions in the Sanskrit *Large Sūtra* are in singular forms because, as mentioned before, the subject here is "emptiness" 空 in singular, which should have remained singular in the Chinese translation. But the problem is: Kumārajīva's translation is one that can be easily misunderstood — in his expression "*zhu fa kong xiang, bu sheng*" … 诸法空相，不生 … , the addition of the modifier "*zhu fa*" 诸法 to the original subject "*kong*" 空, will result in the modified subject "*zhu fa kong xiang*" being easily misunderstood as plural in Chinese. Interestingly, plural form is exactly what is being used in the Sanskrit *Heart Sūtra*. Therefore, as Nattier pointed out: "In each case the Chinese is a perfectly good rendition of the terminology contained in the Sanskrit *Large Sūtra*, while the Sanskrit *Heart Sūtra* in turn represents a perfectly good rendition of the Chinese. Once again the Sanskrit *Heart Sūtra* offers us exactly the kind of synonym-shift that we would expect if it were a back-translation from the Chinese." (Nattier, 1992, p. 172)

2.4 The Emergence of the *Heart Sūtra* and its Frame Sections

Nattier next examined the time-sequence of the emergence of the *Heart Sūtra* as an independent text in China and India. This is important because should the Indian Sanskrit *Heart Sūtra* emerged earlier than its translation in China, back-translation would undoubtedly be proven false. For this Nattier's examined the various commentaries on the text. She discovered that the earliest extant Indian commentaries can only be dated from the 8th century CE. (Donald S. Lopez, 1988, pp. 4, 8-13) (Eckel, 1987, p. 71) Prior to this date there is no independent evidence for the existence of the *Heart Sūtra* (such as citations of it or reports of its existence by Chinese travellers in India).[14] In other words, there is no evidence for the existence of the *Heart Sūtra* before the 8th century CE.

---

[14] Nattier researched into a widely quoted story from Xuanzang's journey to India, which mentions that Bhavaviveka once recited the *Heart Sūtra* in order to conjure up a vision of the *bodhisattva* Avalokiteśvara. (Eckel, 1987, p. 70) (Donald S.Lopez, 1988, p.13) This story, however, which is based on the account given in Samuel Beal translation of the *Xi Yu Ji*: *Buddhist Records of the Western World* [1884; rpt. New York: Paragon Reprint Corp., 1968], vol. 2, pp. 223-225, is a figment of Beal's translation; the text in question is not the *Heart Sūtra* at all (author's note: This story refers to the following record in the《大唐西域记》(*Great Tang Records on the Western Regions*): "Bhavaviveka recited the《随心陀罗尼》(*Wish-Granting Dhāraṇī*) in front of Avalokiteśvara's image. For three years he refused all food, survived on water, and Avalokiteśvara revealed in flesh." (T51.930c) Obviously the text involved is not the *Heart Sūtra*.)

Another piece of Nattier's important research is the Sanskrit palm-leaf manuscript of the *Heart Sūtra* at the Hōryūji temple in Japan purportedly brought from China to Japan in 609 CE. This assertion first appeared in the work of F. Max Müller, and has since been widely quoted in the Western academic world (Conze, 2000, p. 115). However, Nattier pointed out that Müller was in fact misled by his Japanese research assistants. In her own words: "(they) reported to him that a date for the arrival of the *sūtra* in Japan, corresponding to 609 CE, appears in a Japanese source (see F. Max Müller, ed., *Buddhist Texts from Japan*, [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1881], pp. 4-5). Indeed it does; but the source in question, a local chronicle titled *Ikaruga koji benran* (*Memorandum on Ancient Matters of Ikaruga*) composed in 1836, is entirely unreliable on matters of ancient chronology; to cite only one example, it asserts that together with the palm-leaf *Sūtra* the mission that arrived in Japan in 609 brought (*inter alia*) a robe and a bowl belonging to Bodhidharma, items that acquired symbolic importance in Chinese Chan only during and after the time of Shen-hui 神会 (684-758 CE). Such a tradition, in other words, could only have been formulated around 730 CE at the earliest, and thus the assertion that Bodhidharma's robe and bowl reached Japan in 609 CE is patently false, making the parallel claim that the *Heart Sūtra* manuscript was brought by the same mission quite useless as evidence. In the absence of any other source that could provide a concrete date for the arrival of this manuscript in Japan (and accordingly a *terminus ante quem* for its copying in India), we may provisionally accept the evidence (admittedly always tentative) provided by the shape of the letters in the manuscript itself: as G. Bühler asserts in the same volume (Müller, *Buddhist Texts from Japan*, p. 90), 'If we had no historical information [a reference to the Ikaruga chronicle] regarding the age of the Hōryūji palm-leaves, every palaeographist, I believe, would draw from the above facts the inference that [the *Heart Sūtra* manuscript] belonged to the beginning of the eighth century A.D.' Constrained by what he believed was a concrete date for the *Heart Sūtra* manuscript, Bühler went on to use that text to re-evaluate the history of Indian palaeography (pp. 90-95); as we can see, however, such contortions were not necessary, and the appropriate move would have been the reverse." (Nattier, 1992, pp. 208-209, n. 39)

By contrast, commentaries on the *Heart Sūtra* among Chinese records are dated no later than the second half of the 7th century — possibly even decades earlier. But regarding the Chinese *Heart Sūtra* itself, the matter is much more complicated. Although we have the so-called "Kumārajīva version" of the *Heart Sūtra*, this translation is not attributed to Kumārajīva until the (8th century catalogue) *Kaiyuan Catalogue*《开元释教录》, which made no mention of Xuanzang's *Heart Sūtra* [T: first appears in the *Neidian Catalogue* 《内典录》(ca. 7th century); see §8.2]. The earliest extant (Chinese) evidence for the existence of the *Heart Sūtra* is attested at least by Xuanzang's biography regarding his sojourn in Sichuan (ca. 618-622 CE), while the earliest Indian evidence should be Kamalaśīla's commentary of the text — ca. end of the 8th century CE. (Donald S. Lopez, 1988, p. 4, 11) Therefore the conclusion is: the Chinese *Heart Sūtra* predates the Sanskrit *Heart Sūtra*.

Nattier next considers the fact that the *Heart Sūtra*, apart from having a core section which finds its parallel in the *Large Sūtra*, has a so-called "frame-section", i.e. the introductory and concluding sections which have no parallel in the *Large Sūtra*. She noted with insight that all the (peculiar) issues she previously pointed out — the absence of an introductory section, the absence of a concluding section (but the presence of a *dhāraṇī* in its place), the absence of the Buddha (but the presence of Avalokiteśvara in his place) — all show up in the frame section. For her, the question is: If the *Heart Sūtra* were indeed an "apocryphal text", then why does its author not make some effort to make it more authentic sounding, and why is there a lack of native Chinese concepts commonly found in many Chinese apocryphal texts? Nattier found her answers in the works of the well-known Japanese scholar Fukui Fumimasa 福井文雅 — the *Heart Sūtra* is not originally a *sūtra*, and "heart" in the title does not mean "essence" but "*dhāraṇī*". (福井文雅, 1987, pp. 201-207)

The next thing Nattier wished to resolve is why do Avalokiteśvara and a *dhāraṇī* appear in the frame section? Her answer to the former is that the presence of Avalokiteśvara is not unexpected, for this is the most popular *bodhisattva* in southwest China at the time of the 7th century. As an answer to the latter, she pointed out that the *dhāraṇī: gate gate pāragate pārasaṃgate bodhi svāhā* can also be found in some other texts. (McRae, 1998, p. 107, n. 10) In fact, this *dhāraṇī* has a entirely matching parallel in a more complete form, whose author is Xuanzang himself (we will return to this discussion later) [T: see §8.5]. In any case Nattier's thinking is correct. Nattier continues by pointing out that certain unidiomatic Sanskrit expressions found in the frame sections can only make sense if placed in the context of the Chinese language. Having determined that the Chinese *Heart Sūtra* is the antecedent of the Sanskrit *Heart Sūtra*, Nattier went on to conjecture that the Sanskrit text was probably a translation by Xuanzang. (Nattier, 1992, pp. 173-178)

2.5 Xuanzang's Role and the Chinese *Heart Sūtra*

Nattier focused her attention on Xuanzang because she noted one important fact: All extant Chinese commentaries are based on his text in short-form (T251), while all Indo-Tibetan commentaries are based on longer-form versions. What then is Xuanzang's role in the formulation of the Chinese *Heart Sūtra*? The first thing to note is that the *Biography of Xuanzang*《慈恩传》recorded that he was given the *Heart Sūtra* by a monk in Sichuan, and in the course of his westward journey to India he was blessed by the text. Also more importantly, during his stay in India he translated the *Awakening of Faith in the Mahāyāna*《大乘起信论》and other texts into Sanskrit. With these facts, he is thus to this day certainly "the most likely candidate" for the Sanskrit translation of the *Heart Sūtra*. Here, Nattier also pointed out a significant point: In Indo-Sino Buddhist relationship, China is traditionally considered a passive receiver but in fact, the Chinese were also "avid producers of Buddhist *sūtras*", and there had been a transmission of texts from East to West. (Nattier 1992, pp. 180-182)

Next, Nattier dealt with the various issues concerning versions of Chinese *Heart Sūtra* other than Xuanzang's. First, when did the earliest version appear? Second, what was the text Xuanzang received in Sichuan? And third, what changes if any did Xuanzang make to the content of the text he received?

Nattier first dealt with two texts recorded in the catalogue by Shidaoan 释道安 which are probably versions of the *Heart Sūtra*: the one-fascicle《摩诃般若波罗蜜神咒》(*Mahāprajñāpāramitā Divine Vidyā*) and the one-fascicle《般若波罗蜜神咒》(*Prajñāpāramitā Divine Vidyā*). But she soon cautioned that from their titles we are unable to determine what link they had with the *Heart Sūtra*. (Nattier 1992, pp. 182-184) But what really matters is the so-called Kumārajīva's translation of the *Heart Sūtra* (T250). Although his students (notably Seng Zhao 僧肇) read and commented on the core passage of the *Heart Sūtra* found in Kumārajīva's *Large Sūtra*, (McRae, 1988, p. 89 n.9) there is no evidence that they were aware of the existence of the *Heart Sūtra* as a separate text. Furthermore, in the earliest catalogues of Kumārajīva's works no such translation is listed, and for this reason alone the attribution of this text to Kumārajīva is highly suspect. (Nattier, 1992, p. 154)

In addition the (so-called) Kumārajīva *Heart Sūtra* diverges from the Xuanzang version in the following ways:

(1) at the beginning of Kumārajīva's text (T250, 8.847c, lines 5-7) contains 37 characters which have no counterpart in Xuanzang's text;

(2) in the core passage of Kumārajīva's text (T250, 8.847c, line 10), the line stating "these empty *dharmas* are not past, not future, not present" 是空法，非过去，非未来，非现在 has no counterpart in Xuanzang's text;

(3) at another key point in the core passage — that is, in the first statement of the non-difference between form and emptiness — the wording of the two texts differ; and

(4) at various points throughout both the core and the frame sections the two texts differ in their translation of certain Buddhist technical terms (e.g. *prajñāpāramitā skandha*, *bodhisattva*, Avalokiteśvara and Śāriputra).

Based on the word-for-word identity of the elements of the first two features between the so-called Kumārajīva translation of the *Heart Sūtra* and his translation of the *Large Sūtra*, Fukui concluded that this version of the *Heart Sūtra* is indeed a translation by Kumārajīva. But Nattier refuted this view. She noted: "This contention is problematic, however, for it rests on a questionable assumption: namely, that if a single individual (e.g., Kumārajīva) were to translate both the *Heart Sūtra* and the *Large Sūtra* into Chinese from Sanskrit originals, the two Chinese translations should agree word-for-word even though the Sanskrit texts do not. For, as we have already seen, the Sanskrit texts of the *Heart Sūtra* and the *Large Sūtra* diverge in a number of respects. Thus the nearly verbatim agreement between the two Chinese texts should instead arouse our suspicions. Moreover, even if a certain translator were to render two perfectly identical texts on two separate occasions into a second language, the odds against his or her choosing exactly the same word in each instance are enormous. And this is especially true of a translator like Kumārajīva, who is renowned not for a wooden faithfulness to the Sanskrit original but for his fluid and context sensitive renditions." (Nattier, 1992, p. 186) Nattier's argument is very convincing, especially considering the fact that the Sanskrit *Large Sūtra* and the Sanskrit *Heart Sūtra* are basically different texts. So, the probability of two different texts being translated into two verbatim sutras is almost none.

The third of the above list of divergence is very important. Not only does the wording of the initial statement of the non-difference between form and emptiness of the (so-called) Kumārajīva translation of the *Heart Sūtra* diverge from the Xuanzang version, it also diverges from Kumārajīva's own translation — the *Mohe boruo boluomi jing*《摩诃般若波罗蜜经》(i.e. T223, "*Large Sūtra*"). Rather, it corresponds to his translation of the *Dazhidu lun*《大智度论》(**Mahāprajñāpāramitopadeśa*). In other words, the (so-called) Kumārajīva *Heart Sūtra* is not based on the *Large Sūtra* translated by him but on the *Large Sūtra* cited in the *Dazhidu lun*.

Nattier then made the interesting observation that the (so-called) Kumārajīva version never became popular in China — not a single Chinese commentary is based on this version. Considering the fact that Xuanzang's translation style is "cumbersome and (by Chinese standards) overly literal", any Kumārajīva version of the same work will be the more popular of the two. But in the case of the *Heart Sūtra*, the situation is the other way round. Therefore, we can conclude that the (so-called) Kumārajīva *Heart Sūtra* is not his work, nor is it an independent work translated from Sanskrit. (Nattier, 1992, pp. 182-189)

As for Xuanzang's *Heart Sūtra*, Nattier made a significant observation: Xuanzang translated the entire compendium of Prajñāpāramitā sutras, i.e. the 600-fascicle *Da boruo jing*《大般若经》, in which he included all the *sūtras* ranging from the *Śatasāhasrikā-prajñāpāramitā-sūtra*《般若十万颂》(*Perfection of Wisdom in 100,000 Lines*) to the *Suvikrāntavikrāmī-paripṛcchā-sūtra*《善勇猛般若经》(*Questions of Suvikrāntavikrāmī*). Thus, if the *Heart Sūtra* was indeed his work, it would have also been included in the *Da boruo jing* but it has not. This shows that the work was once listed as "translator unknown" 失译经 and was only later and for some peculiar reasons became associated with Xuanzang. (Nattier, 1992, pp. 189-190)

What then is Xuanzang's role in the version of *Heart Sūtra* associated with his name? Nattier pointed out that in the literal translation (not transliteration) of certain technical terms the Xuanzang *Heart Sūtra* differs from the (so-called) Kumārajīva text. For example, in the former, Śāriputra is translated as "*she li zi*" 舍利子 instead of "*she li fo*" 舍利弗, Avalokiteśvara as "*guan zi zai*" 观自在 instead of "*guan shi yin*" 观世音, and Sanskirt *skandha* as "*yun*" 蘊 instead of "*yin*" 阴. Such translations are typical of Xuanzang. It therefore shows that the version associated with his name had been edited by him.

Nattier next discussed Xuanzang's so-called transliteration (T256). On this, Nattier accepted Fukui's argument that the text is not the work of Xuanzang at all but is probably that of Amoghavajra 不空 (Fukui Fumimasa, 1987, p. 92-115)

In addition, Nattier also established the fact that when *Duoxin jing*《多心经》was referred to in Tang, it referred "specifically to Xuanzang's *Heart Sūtra*." This shows that it was Xuanzang who was "responsible for the widespread popularity of the *sūtra* in China, and in all probability for its initial circulation (and perhaps its translation into Sanskrit) in India as well." (Nattier, 1992, pp. 193-194)

2.6 Authenticity of Buddhist Texts — Different Criteria, Indian and Chinese

There is a very interesting difference between the Indian *Heart Sūtra* and its Chinese counterpart, namely, all commentaries on the *Heart Sūtra* in India are based on the longer form of the text, while in China all extant commentaries are based on the shorter form edited by Xuanzang. How is such a difference to be explained? For this, Nattier examined the different criteria for determining the authenticity of Buddhist texts in India and in China.

The Chinese viewpoint is that for a Buddhist text to be authentic, it must be translated from the Indian source language. Thus the author of an apocryphal text would introduce into his work elements that resemble Indian. "In other words, the first criterion of scriptural legitimacy was that of geography, for any text that had no demonstrated Indian pedigree was, on those grounds alone, suspect." (Nattier, 1992, pp. 195-196) On this point, my following view is in complete agreement with Nattier: "To ancient Chinese scholars in bibliography … their fundamental criterion for determining the authenticity of a Buddhist scripture is whether it has a translated version. Or simply put, whether it has, as its source, a barbarous version (胡本) or a Sanskrit version. In other words, in the minds of the Chinese Buddhists, the authority of a scripture is self-evident as long as it is a translated text." (Ji Yun 紀贇, 2011, pp. 72-73)

By contrast, the Indian viewpoint is quite different. Nattier pointed out that Indian Buddhists had a very clear way of judging if a particular scripture was authentic. On the one hand, it had to agree with the other teachings of the Buddha. On the other hand, it had to be something “heard” from a legitimate source. It is this latter criterion that led to the eventual formulation of an absolute, single criterion for authenticity — a legitimate *sūtra* has to conform to the three-part genre comprising an opening section (with stock phrases) 序分, a narration 正宗分, and a closing section 流通分. By this criterion, the long-form *Heart Sūtra* is a *sūtra* and the shorter-form version is not. Nattier further suggested that the reason for the emergence of the longer version is because it is “the result of the domestication of a Chinese product to fit the demands of the Indian Buddhist market.” (Nattier, 1992, pp. 196-197) Nattier’s Indian criterion for determining Indian scriptural authenticity is inappropriate. Should this be the case the many Mahāyāna texts, complete with the three-part genre, would not have met with so much resistance in India as they did since they were considered apocryphal. In fact I once pointed out that the main difference between Mahāyāna texts and the many early Buddhist sutras, or the reason why the authority of Mahāyāna texts was once severely challenged, is because they were not incorporated into the relatively closed system of early Buddhist literature through sessions of joint recitation [T: i.e. *saṅgīti*]. (Ji Yun 紀贇, 2011, pp. 68-70) Despite her Indian criterion being inappropriate, Nattier is right — having a complete three-part genre is indeed an essential feature for Indian and Tibetan Buddhist sutras.

Presented above is an approximate outline of Nattier’s research. First, as its main conclusion, the author tried to demonstrate a philological sequence flowing from the Sanskrit *Large Sūtra* (through the Chinese *Large Sūtra* of Kumārajīva) to the *Heart Sūtra* popularized by Xuanzang to the Sanskrit *Large Sūtra*.

Second, she demonstrated the role of Xuanzang in the transmission of the Chinese *Heart Sūtra* to India, and perhaps even in the translation of the text into Sanskrit. In other words, it is technically an “apocryphal text”, “created as a separate scripture in China, composed of an extract from the *Large Sūtra* of Kumārajīva (itself a translation of the Indian *Pañcaviṃśat-prajñāpāramitā-sūtra*), together with an introduction and conclusion composed in China.”

Nevertheless the author emphasizes that "this in no way undermines the value that the text has held for Buddhist practitioners." (Nattier, 1992, p. 199)

3. Conze's Research with Comments

3.1 *Heart Sūtra* and its Place in Prajñāpāramitā Literature

Even to this day Edward Conze (1904-1979) the German British scholar has to be regarded, not as one of many, but as the most important researcher on Prajñāpāramitā literature. This genius of Buddhist linguist and philologist devoted his whole life to the collation, translation and research of Prajñāpāramitā literature in Sanskrit, Tibetan and Chinese — a language relatively neglected by European scholars before him. Although the research of this prolific writer covers beyond the Prajñāpāramitā category, his works dedicated solely to this subject, according to an incomplete count by the Japanese scholar Yuyama Akira (汤山明), include 16 books and 46 articles. His bibliography on the subject goes on for as many as 11 pages. (Conze, 2000a, pp. 127-138) In the history of Prajñāpāramitā research Conze can be regarded as a formidable scholar with no comparison, and perhaps even one without precedence.[15]

Included in his research on Prajñāpāramitā literature is of course the *Heart Sūtra*. Conze's studies on this text are mainly found in the second edition of his general work on the subject: *The Prajñāpāramitā Literature* (Tokyu: The Reiyukai, 1978). The version I used is the new 2000 edition by Munshiram Manoharlal Publishers Pvt. Ltd., of New Delhi, India.

---

[15] Conze lived a colourful life. He harboured left-leaning worldviews in his early days in Germany and was expelled from the country for refusing to fly the Nazi flag. After his disenchantment with politics he shifted his attention to religious studies but maintained throughout his life his leftist tendency. As a result of his stance against the Vietnam War in his old age, he was unable to remain in America and Canada. Remarkably, this genius, well-versed in over a dozen languages, was not a professional Buddhist researcher in his old age but had to earn his living teaching languages and phycology. Such (perseverance) serves to spur on Buddhist academics like us. For more information, please refer to the autobiography by Conze published before his death. It contains records from his early days and his correspondence with some of the great Buddhist researchers of his time.

In *The Prajñāpāramitā Literature*, Conze divided all Prajñāpāramitā sutras into (four) phases. This division has also been adopted by some other major scholars such as Warder (in his *Indian Buddhism* for instance). (A.K. Warder, 1970, pp. 546-549) This division is of great significance to our understanding of some of the specific features of the *Heart Sūtra* and the time of its composition. Therefore I will spend some time here discussing it and relating it to our analysis of the *Heart Sūtra*.

Conze's time-division is broadly as follows:

1) The period of elaboration of basic Prajñāpāramitā texts (ca. 100 BC to 100 CE). In terms of specific work, Conze considered the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā-prajñāpāramitā-sūtra*《八千颂般若经》in 32 chapters and 8000 *ślokas* to be the oldest. The word 颂 in the Chinese title refers to the unit of count in Sanskrit verses (i.e. *śloka*). Although most Prajñāpāramitā texts basically belong to (the literary type) *sūtra*, their unit of count is the *śloka* ("line")— a term derived from the Sanskrit root *śru* "to hear". So the approximate Chinese meaning of *śloka* is 歌赞 ("songs of praise") or 颂 ("verse") in ancient translation; or 首卢, 室路迦, and so on in ancient transliteration. A *śloka* is a passage of 32 syllables. (Conze, 2000a, p. 1) Of course, the *Heart Sūtra* also contains many additions by later authors, all of which can be traced through the evolution of its Chinese translations. (Conze, 2000a, p. 8-10)

2) The period of expansion of basic texts (ca 100-300 CE). After about 100 CE the basic Prajñāpāramitā texts expanded into a "Large Prajñāpāramitā", as represented by the following three extant texts: the *Śatasāhasrikāprajñā-prajñāpāramitā-sūtra* (Ś)《十万颂般若》(*Perfect Wisdom in 100,000 Lines*), the *Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikā-*

prajñāpāramitā-sūtra (P)《二万五千颂般若》(*Perfect Wisdom in 25,000 Lines*), and the *Aṣṭādaśasāhasrikā-prajñāpāramitā-sūtra* (Ad)《一万八千颂般若》(*Perfect Wisdom in 18,000 Lines*) [T: all 3 texts are included in Xuanzang's 600-fascicle *Da boruo jing*《大般若经》(T220) — Ś: fascicles 1-400, *P*: fascicles 401-478, and *Ad*: fascicles 479-537, from the first, second and third *hui* (会, "sermon-meetings") conducted on the Vulture Peak (after Conze, 2000a, p. 21)]. These texts are in fact one and the same, differing only in their degree of repetition. Two other texts were found in this period: the *Pañcaśatikā-prajñāpāramitā-sūtra*《般若五百颂》(*Perfect Wisdom in 500 Lines*), and the *Kāruṇikarāja-prajñāpāramitā-sūtra*《仁王护国般若经》(*Prajñāpāramitā Sūtra Explaining How Benevolent Kings May Protect Their Countries*). (Conze, 2000a, pp. 10-11)

3) The period of doctrinal re-statement in the form of short *sūtras* and versified summaries (ca. 300-500 CE). The reason for the emergence of this period is because of the appearance of massive work in the form of "Large Prajñāpāramitā" in the second phase, and also because of the confusing way Prajñāpāramitā texts were organized. These factors, plus the abstract and difficult nature of Prajñāpāramitā ideas, had impeded the mastering of them by monks and lay people, and had resulted in the emergence of two solutions. One is the production of new and shorter works that are more philosophical; and two is the condensed summarisation of large texts.

Into the first category of shorter *sūtras*, Conze placed the 25-*śloka* version (long-form) and the 14-*śloka* version (short-form) of the *Heart Sūtra*, plus the 300-*śloka Vajracchedikā-prajñāpāramitā-sūtra* (which Conze himself had arranged and translated). Of these texts, he described the *Heart Sūtra* in these words: "The *Heart Sūtra*, one of the sublimest spiritual documents of mankind, is a re-statement of the four Holy Truths, reinterpreted in the light of the dominant idea of emptiness." (Conze, 2000a, p. 11) (Chen Yu Jiao, 陈玉蛟 1988, pp. 159-160) In later discussion I will explain in detail why placing the *Heart Sūtra* in this phase and in this category is wrong.

4) The period of tantric influence (600-1200 CE). With the spread of tantric thought after 600 CE, Prajñāpāramitā ideas and teachings were adapted to this new trend. However, the new Vajrayāna concepts are introduced only in the *Adhyardhaśatikā-prajñāpāramitā-sūtra* [T: alternative title *Prajñāpāramitā-naya-śatapañcāśatikā* (*Perfect Wisdom in 150 Lines*)], and the Chinese translations include the *Boruo liqu jing*《般若理趣经》by Xuanzang （T220）; the *Dale jinggang bukong zhenshi sanmaye jing*《大乐金刚不空真时三么耶经》by Amoghavajra 不空 （Bu Kong）（T243） and others (see note 17). Prajñāpāramitā texts under tantric influence display three features, one of which is an attempt to compress the Prajñāpāramitā message into short but effective spells. Already in the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā*《八千颂》, *prajñāpāramitā* had been described as a *vidyā* (明咒), used to ward off evil spirits. In his translation of the *Mahāmāyūrī*《孔雀王咒经》(T988), Kumārajīva mentions *prajñāpāramitā-dhāraṇī* 摩诃般若波罗蜜神咒 and *Avalokiteśvara-dhāraṇī* 观世音菩萨陀罗尼神咒. (Conze, 2000a, p. 13) In other words, in Kumārajīva's days at least, Prajñāpāramitā already showed signs of being used as a magic power. And this point can provide some aid in our understanding of why a *vidyā* (mantra) is found in the Chinese *Heart Sūtra*. In later discussion, I will talk more about the actual source of this mantra in the *Heart Sūtra*.

By about 550 CE, old style Prajñāpāramitā literature was no longer produced. In their place was a series of short Prajñāpāramitā texts composed between 600 CE and 1200 CE such as the *Svalpākṣarā-prajñāpāramitā-sūtra*《圣佛母小字般若波罗蜜多经》（T258）（*The Holy Buddha Mother, the Perfect Wisdom in a Few Words*）, which displays many similarities with the *Heart Sūtra*. I will return to the discussion of this text later.

Similarly there are ten other very short Prajñāpāramitā texts in the Chinese or Tibetan canon such as: the *Adhyardhaśatikā*;[16] the *Kauśika prajñāpāramitā-sūtra*;[17] the *Prajñāpāramitā Sūryagarbha mahāyāna sūtra* 《般若波罗蜜多日藏大乘经》[T: corrected from *Ākāśagarbha*] ; the *Candragarbha prajñāpāramitā mahāyāna-sūtra*《月藏般若波罗蜜多大乘经》; the *Prajñāpāramitā Samantabhadra mahāyāna sūtra*《般若波罗蜜多普賢王如來大乘经》; the *Prajñāpāramitā Vajrapāṇi mahāyāna-sūtra*《般若波罗蜜多金刚手菩萨大乘经》; the *Prajñāpāramitā Vajraketu mahāyāna-sūtra* 《般若波罗蜜多金刚幡大乘经》;[18] the *Prajñāpāramitā nāma-aṣṭaśatakā* 《圣八千颂般若波羅蜜多一百八名真实圆义陀罗尼经》(*The 108 Marks of Perfect Wisdom*),[19] and etc. These short Sanskrit and Tibetan texts were compiled and translated by Conze himself (E. Conze, *Perfect Wisdom: The Short Prajnaparamita Texts*, 1973).

---

[16] This is the *Boruo liqu jing* 《般若理趣经》also known as the 《百五十颂般若波罗蜜多经》(*Perfect Wisdom in 150 Lines*); its Sanskrit editions include: (E. Leumann, 1912); (Toganō Shōun 栂尾祥云, 1932, pp. 1-9); its Chinese translations include: T220 (Xuanzang 玄奘, 660 CE); T240 (Bodhiruci 菩提流志 693 CE); T241 (Vajrabodhi 金刚智, 725 CE); T243 (Amoghavajra 不空, 770 CE); T242 (Dānapāla 施护, 980 CE); T244 (Dharmabhadra 法贤, 999 CE); its Tibetan translation is *śes-rab-kyi pha-rol-tu phyin-pa'i tshul brgya lṅa bcu-pa*. Its previous manuscript from Central Asia is incomplete; a complete edition is recently discovered in China. Following the studies by Tomabechi Tōru 苫米地等流 of University of Hamburg, an excellent combined (Khotanese)-Tibetan edition was published (Tomabechi, 2009).

[17] Kauśika is the name of the deity 帝释天. The literal Chinese title is 《㤭戸迦般若经》; its Sanskrit version was jointly edited by Conze (Conze, 1956a) and Vaidya (P.L. Vaidya, 1961, pp. 95-95); its Chinese version is *Dishi Boruo boluomiduo xin jing* 《帝释般若波罗蜜多心经》(T249) translated by Dānapāla 施护 (980 CE) of Northern Song; its Tibetan translation is *śes-rab-kyi pha-rol-tu phyin-pa Ko'uśika shes bya-ba*. (Conze, 2000, pp. 82-83)

[18] The above five texts [T: corrected from "four texts"] have no extant Sanskrit edition or Chinese translation, only Tibetan and Mongolian. (Conze, 2000a, pp.83-84)

[19] This was translated into Chinese by Dānapāla (施护) of Northern Song (T230); there is no extant Sanskrit version, only Tibetan and Mongolian versions. (Conze, 2000a, pp.83-84) [T: Chinese title literally reads "*Ārya-aṣṭasahasra-gāthā-prajñāpāramitā nāma aṣṭaśata-satya-pūrṇārtha-dhāraṇī-sūtra*]

Also included in this book are (his English translations of): Sanskrit *Suvikrāntavikrāmī-paripṛcchā-prajñāpāramitā(-nirdeśa)-sūtra* 《善勇猛般若经》(*The Questions of Suvikrāntavikrāmin*)[20] (pp. 1-78); Sanskrit *Saptaśatikā-prajñāpāramitā-sūtra*《文殊师利所说摩诃般若波罗蜜经》(*The Prajñāpāramitā as Taught by Mañjuśrī*)[21] (pp. 79-107); Tibetan *Ḥphags-pa śes-rab-kyi-pha-rol-tu-phyin-pa lṅa-brgya-pa*《般若五百颂》[22] (pp. 108-121), Sanskrit *Vajracchedikā-prajñāpāramitā-sūtra*《金刚经》(*Diamond Sūtra*) (pp. 122-139); Sanskrit 25-*śloka* long-form *Heart Sūtra* (pp. 140-141); Sanskrit short-form *Heart Sūtra* (pp. 142-143); Sanskrit *Svalpākṣarā-prajñāpāramitā-sūtra* (*Perfect Wisdom in a Few Words*)[23] (pp. 144-147); Tibetan *Prajñāpāramitā Sūryagarbha mahāyāna-sūtra* (pp. 148-149); Tibetan *Candragarbha prajñāpāramitā mahāyāna-sūtra* (pp. 149-151); Tibetan *Prajñāpāramitā Samantabhadra mahāyāna-sūtra* (pp. 151-152); Tibetan *Prajñāpāramitā Vajrapāṇi mahāyāna-sūtra* (p. 152); Tibetan *Prajñāpāramitā Vajraketu mahāyāna-sūtra*[24] (pp. 152-153), Tibetan *Prajñāpāramitā-ardhaśatikā*[25] (pp. 154-

---

[20] Also known as *Sārddhadvisāhasrikā prajñāpāramitā-sūtra* 《般若二千五百颂》(*Perfection of Wisdom in 2,500 Lines*), which corresponds to no. 16 hui (会, "sermon-meeting") of Xuanzang's *Da boruo jing* 《大般若经》. There is also a Sanskrit edition of Japan. (Hikata, 1958)

[21] The Sanskrit title literally reads "*The Perfection of Wisdom in 700 Lines*"; this is the 《般若七百颂》(T232) in no. 7 *hui* (会, "sermon-meeting") in Xuanzang's *Da boruo jing*.

[22] Conze pointed out in his introduction that translation from Tibetan may not be as accurate as from Sanskrit. The Chinese equivalent is the *Kaijue zixing boruo jing* 《开觉自性般若经》by Wei Jing 惟净 of Song.

[23] This is a very important text and I will have more discussion on it later.

[24] These five Tibetan translations are the only extant editions. There is no Sanskrit or Chinese equivalent. Conze's translation is from the Narthang edition of the *Kanjur*.

[25] The Chinese translation is 《五十颂圣般若波罗蜜经》(T248) (*The Perfection of Wisdom in 50 Lines*) translated by Dānapāla 施护 of Song. Conze also translated this text (into English) from Tibetan. According to his note, the Chinese translation is more concise than the Tibetan. (Conze, 1973, p.iv)

156); and Tibetan *Kauśika prajñāpāramitā-sūtra*[26] (pp. 157-159). Next Conze gave the abridged English translations of two Chinese texts: the *Foshuo rushou pusa wushang qingjing fenwei jing*《佛说濡首菩萨无上清淨分卫经》(*Buddha's Preaching on the Utmost Tranquil Mañjuśrī Bodhisattva Taking Alms*)[27] (pp. 160-164); and the *Karuṇikarāja-prajñāpāramitā-sūtra*[28] (pp. 165-183). Conze then presented the English translations of some Prajñāpāramitā texts that are purely tantric in nature: the Sanskrit/Tibetan *Prajñāpāramitā-naya-śatapañcāśatikā*《百五十颂般若经》(*Perfect Wisdom in 150 Lines*)[29] (pp. 184-195); the Tibetan *Prajñāpāramitā nāma-aṣṭaśatakā (The 108 Marks of Perfect Wisdom)*[30] (pp. 196-198); and the Tibetan *Pañcaviṃśati-prajñāpāramitā-mukha*《圣般若二十五门经》(*The 25 Doors of Perfection of Wisdom*) (pp. 199-200). Of all these short texts the shortest is the *Bhagavatī prajñāpāramitā sarva-Tathāgata-mātā ekākṣarā nāma*《一字般若波罗蜜多经》(*Perfect Wisdom in One Letter*) in which the wisdom of Prajñāpāramitā is contained in the one and only syllable "*oṃ*" (p. 201). As most of the above translations of Conze are based on Sanskrit and Tibetan editions, of which some have not been translated into Chinese, they are highly valuable resources for Prajñāpāramitā studies for the Chinese academic world. It is regrettable that their importance has hitherto been neglected. I have digressed and shall now return to the main discussion.

---

[26] See n. 17 on the title of this text. According to Conze, the Tibetan edition of this text presented here is shorter than the Sanskrit and Chinese editions, with 12 *dhāraṇī* less. (Conze, *Perfect Wisdom: The Short Prajnaparamita Texts*, 1973, p.iv)

[27] This abridged translation drew reference from both the *Foshuo rushou pusa wushang qingjing fenwei jing* and Xuanzang's *Da boruo jing* newly translated by Lancaster.

[28] The source text of this abridged English translation was twice translated: once by Kumārajīva and the other time by Amoghavajra 不空. Conze based his translation on the latter.

[29] According to Conze this is translated from Sanskrit and Tibetan and drew reference from the German translation of the Khotanese edition. However, it did not consult the Khotanese edition or the other six Chinese translations. A well-known Chinese version of this text is the *Boruo liqu jing*《般若理趣经》(Skt. *Adhyarhaśatikā*). Other Chinese translations include those by Bodhiruci 菩提流支, Vajrabodhi 金刚智, Amoghavajra 不空, Dānapāla 施护, Dharmabhadra 法贤 and others; it is found in no. 10 *hui* (会, "sermon-meeting") of Xuanzang's *Da boruo jing*. All these are easily accessible and are not furthered notated here.

[30] This text was translated by Dānapāla (施护) and not, as mistaken by Conze, Fa Xian (法显); the two lived way apart in time. (Conze, 1973, p.vii)

From the texts listed above and in the terms of their succinctness, we can see that Nattier's point about Prajñāpāramitā texts being relatively lengthy is, given the historical background of their development, one-sided; there are indeed many short sutras amongst them. The only thing is: this category of texts is the product of the development of a specific Buddhist school — more specifically, it evolved and developed after Tang. Viewed under this historical background — and not placing it at the infancy of the development of Prajñāpāramitā literature — the emergence of the *Heart Sūtra* is then less unexpected. This is a very important point to bear in mind in our studies of the *sūtra* and in our determination of its historical place. In later discussion, I will return to stress my point that the *Heart Sūtra* should be classified under the fourth period, namely, in the period under tantric influence after 600 CE and not, as Conze did, under the third. I will present my proofs in later discussions.

We can in fact go one step further and look for texts similar to the *Heart Sūtra* in the history of the entire Prajñāpāramitā literature. I just mentioned that in his classification, Conze placed the *Heart Sūtra* in the same category as the *Vajracchedikā-prajñāpāramitā-sūtra* and others. This has prompted us to ask: what sutras in the canon, or more accurately in the Prajñāpāramitā literature, are indeed quite similar to the *Heart Sūtra*? And could their common features in some way dispel some of the doubts we have regarding the unusual features of the *Heart Sūtra* Nattier mentioned? Or could these common features give us the necessary background for understanding the *Heart Sūtra* (whether Sanskrit or Chinese), or its composition or translation?

Nattier remarked in her studies that the appearance of Avalokiteśvara in Prajñāpāramitā literature was unexpected. However, at least in the period when such literature was under tantric influence, the role of Avalokiteśvara already appeared in some Buddhist texts that are proven authentic. For example, Western scholars have long recognized the interesting similarities between the *Heart Sūtra* and the *Svalpākṣarā-prajñāpāramitā-sūtra* (*Perfect Wisdom in a Few Words*) translated by Tian Xizai 天息灾 of Song. (Willemen, 1973) (Conze, 2000a, p. 81) There is a Sanskrit edition of the *Svalpākṣarā* dated about 1000 CE and edited by Conze and Vaidya. (Conze, 1956b) (P.L.Vaidya, 1961, pp. 93-94) There is also a Nepalese manuscript dated about 1700 CE, edited by Yumaya Akira 汤山明. (Yuyama, 1977) The Sanskrit *Svalpākṣarā* has been translated by Conze into English in consultation with Chinese and Tibetan translations. (Conze, 1973, pp. 144-147)

Below I shall compare the *Svalpākṣarā* with the *Heart Sūtra* to see what commonalities they share and what features they display compared to the rest of the Prajñāpāramitā literature:

(1) The Sanskrit *Svalpākṣarā* displays something interesting. For example, following "*idaṁ ca prajñāpāramitā-hṛdayam-āgrahītavyam*" (literally: "and this *prajñāpāramitā-hṛdaya* is to be recited" [T: *āgrahītavyam* means "to be gained, received, accepted"] — which has as its Chinese parallel "*boruo boluomiduoxin*" 般若波罗蜜多心 in Tian Xizai's translation — is a mantra (while the Chinese version has additional intervening text), thus proving indirectly that the word "*hṛdaya*" refers to mantra, something consistent with the *Heart Sūtra*;

(2) Although the narrator in the *Svalpākṣarā* is the Buddha himself, importantly his conversation is with Avalokiteśvara; Subhūti makes no appearance just like the *Heart Sūtra*;

(3) Like the *Heart Sūtra* the *Svalpākṣarā* is also very brief;

(4) The *Svalpākṣarā* also [sic] has two spells (i.e. a short mantra and a long *dhāraṇī*) [T: text in bracket after Conze 2000a, p. 21].

Apart from the *Svalpākṣarā*, another concise Prajñāpāramitā text mentioned above — the *Kauśika prajñāpāramitā-sūtra*《帝释般若波罗蜜多心经》(T249) — also deserves our attention. If the *Heart Sūtra*, having undergone dissection by Nattier, is viewed as consisting of parts unravelled from various texts, then we can also see the uncontentious *Kauśika* as being dissected into fragments obtainable from various Buddhist sutras. There are following the opening section: a passage of the double negatives common to Prajñāpāramitā texts — "not one or various; not with signs or without" 非一非异、非相非无相; a passage from the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā*; the famous verse of "eight-likeness" from the *Vajracchedikā* [T: Chap 32a]; two quotations from Nāgārjuna's *Mūlamadhyamakakārikā* [T: Chap. 1.1-2]; a number of spells (one of which is an echo of the *prajñāpāramitā-dhāraṇī*, and as the last, the mantra of the *Heart Sūtra*) [T: addition in bracket after Conze, 2000a, pp. 82-3]. If we go by Nattier's logic we can see in this text at least two things that generate questions: Why is the Buddha preaching to Kauśika — a common figure in Āgama sutras — instead of to a common Prajñāpāramitā figure such as Subhūti? Why is this text, although complete with opening and concluding sections, ends with a mantra too?

There is also *The 108 Marks of Perfect Wisdom* (T230) [T: see note 20] translated by Dānapāla 施护 of Song. Although its Sanskrit version is no longer extant, it has a full Tibetan translation from Sanskrit. Here we see that just like the *Heart Sūtra*, this text is without an opening and a closing section, and it ends with a *dhāraṇī*.

From the above discussion and considering the situation of the Prajñāpāramitā literature as a whole, we see that the emergence of the *Heart Sūtra* is not as strange as we first thought and was accompanied by a host of related sutras. But in order to dispel any lingering doubts we need to pin its production to a historical date.

There is one further point that requires our attention: In terms of its textual background, the *Heart Sūtra* (regardless of whether it should be entitled "*sūtra*") should be viewed against the backdrop of the entire Prajñāpāramitā literature. Hence, it is necessary to review the history circulation of Prajñāpāramitā texts in China, namely, what texts were transmitted and which are the more popular ones?

Looking at the period of Tang when Xuanzang more or less spent his life, we are not entirely clear about the prevailing situation of Buddhist texts then. However, we can be certain that his 600-fascicle compendium the *Da Bo Re Jing*《大般若经》was not particularly popular among worshippers. This can be gleaned from a little statistics on the Dunhuang manuscripts. The Japanese scholar Ikeda On 池田溫, basing his numbers on Huang Yong Wu's Latest Catalogue of Dunhuang Historical Manuscripts (Beijing Collection) (黄永武《敦煌遗书最新目录》北京藏部分), estimated that among the Dunhuang Buddhist sutras there are: 1698 entries of the Saddharma-puṇḍarīka-sūtra《法华经》(Fahua jing) translated by Kumārajīva; 1412 entries of the Da boruo jing《大般若经》by Xuanzang; 928 entries of the Vajracchedikā《金刚经》translated by Kumārajīva; 569 entries of the Suvarṇaprabhāsa-uttamarāja-sūtra《金光明经》. (池田溫, 1992, pp. 36-37) While the number of entries attributed to Xuanzang may look high, the popularity of his works is not commensurate with either the (monumental) size of his Da boruo jing compendium or its significance.

This situation (of massive work being unpopular) not only existed in China but also in India and Tibet. Thus the emergence in India in the third period of Conze classification mentioned above, of schematic works in verse form, distilling from Prajñāpāramitā ideas its essence using succinct language; for instance, the very famous work *Abhisamaya-alaṅkāra*《现观庄严论》[T: a 5th century recast version of The Perfection of Wisdom in 25,000 Lines (Conze, 2000a, p.36)]. This way the Buddhists managed to resolve the problem with overly massive Prajñāpāramitā texts, which make their reading and understanding of them difficult. (Conze, 2000a, p. 12) (Chen Yu Jiao 陳玉蛟, 1988, p. 160)

But compared to Indians and Tibetans the Chinese probably had greater preference for conciseness such that even the Abhisamaya-alaṅkāra was considered somewhat overly lengthy. Therefore of all Prajñāpāramitā literature, the more popular ones were the Vajracchedikā and the *Heart Sūtra* and not the seemingly overly difficult and "lengthy" Abhisamaya-alaṅkāra. We can thus see the reason why the *Heart Sūtra* rapidly gained popularity after Tang – it has to do with the taste for brevity of the Chinese.

5) The period of the Pāla dynasty (750-1200 CE). [T: corrected from '750-1174', after Conze, 2000a, p. 16] After 1200 CE, there is no further production of Prajñāpāramitā texts in India. Before this however, Prajñāpāramitā ideas did make a come back since the emperors of the dynasty were believers of a mixture of Prajñāpāramitā and tantric ideas. As a result, there was a profusion of commentaries to Prajñāpāramitā texts, which basically existed in Tibetan translations only. The commentators of this time were unaware of the historical development of Prajñāpāramitā texts, and were always keen to impose their own set of methodologies to unify the many complicated sutras. (Conze, 2000, pp. 16-17) We should know that as far as the Prajñāpāramitā-hṛdaya-sūtra is concerned, its many Tibetan commentaries are only comprehensible if they are placed against the historical backdrop (of this period). I will return to discuss this later when I present the research by Lopez Jr.

3.2 Conze's Discourse on the *Heart Sūtra* in The Prajñāpāramitā Literature

In *The Prajñāpāramitā Literature* by Conze, the most important section to the studies of the *Heart Sūtra* is his annotated bibliography included as an appendix to his classification of the entire Prajñāpāramitā literature. In it discourse on the *Heart Sūtra* amounts to eight pages. (Conze, 2000a, pp. 67-74) I am aware that Nattier had benefited much from it, which no doubt will continue to be a valuable reference to our future studies on the *Heart Sūtra*. I will present below a summary with detailed comments. Please note that for the different *Heart Sūtra* editions in various languages including Sanskrit, one should also be aware of Yamada Ryujo's 山田龙城 summary of compilations of the Sanskrit *Heart Sūtra* done by Japanese scholars (山田龙城, 1977, from p. 89) (山田龙城, 1988, pp. 222-223, 231, notes 60-65), apart from Lin Guang Ming's work mentioned above (林光明, 2000). For the latest Japanese studies on Sanskrit *Heart Sūtra*, one may consult Okukaze Eiko (奥風栄弘, 2011).

Collated editions of the Sanskrit *Heart Sūtra*:

1) Edited by Conze (Conze, 1948)

This article is also found in pages 149-154 of *Thirty Years of Buddhist Studies* by Conze. I will talk more about this edition in subsequent discussion.

2) Edited by Müller (Müller, 1884)

First some background. This edition is one of a monograph series managed by Friedrich Max Müller, then Professor of Religion at the Oxford University. This series is a publication of the manuscripts collected at the various Oxford libraries mainly the Bodleian. In the *Aryan Series*, the very first volume is the *Buddhist Texts from Japan*, where all Buddhist sutras in Sanskrit can be traced back to Japan as their source. There are three parts to this volume, published respectively in 1881, 1883 and 1884: Part 1 being the *Vajracchedikā-prajñāpāramitā*; Part 2 the *Sukhāvatīvyūha Sūtra*《无量寿经》; and Part 3 a joint edition of the *Prajñāpāramitā-hṛdaya-sūtra* and the (*Sarva-durgati-pariśodhana*)*-uṣṇīṣa-vijaya-dhāraṇī*《佛顶尊胜陀罗尼》. As the monograph was published more than a hundred years ago, the authors used a form of Roman transcription for their Sanskrit in the appendices that is quite different from current usage. Fortunately, all the original Sanskrit texts are in the Devanāgarī script. So, the material is still very accessible to modern-day researchers.

I will now briefly talk about the origin of this collated edition. In Part 1 of the *Buddhist Texts from Japan*, Müller said that he was first aware of the existence of Sanskrit Buddhist texts in Japan in 1873. Later in 1879 two Japanese monks came to Cambridge to study

Sanskrit: Nanjō Bunyū 南条文雄 (1849-1927) and Kasawara Kenjiu 笠原研寿 (1852-83) (author's note: the latter was diagnosed with late stage of tuberculosis in 1881. He died soon after). Müller took the opportunity and urged the two monks to make inquiries in Japan about the existence of Sanskrit manuscripts. In December of the same year (i.e. 1879), Müller obtained his first Buddhist manuscript in Sanskrit from Japan via Nanjō — the smaller *Sukhāvatī-vyūha* 《阿弥陀经》, and had it published in the *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* in April 1880 (author's note: Nanjiō and Kasawara undertook their Sanskrit studies with Müller in January, 1880. In September of the same year Nanjiō attended the Berlin Conference of Orientalists with Müller and met with many top scholars — an experience that had a very positive effect to his life-long academic pursuit).

Müller's publication attracted the attention of a certain Mr Wylie, who sent Müller some of the books he obtained from Japan. Upon examination, Müller found among them the *Vajracchedikā*, the *Prajñāpāramitā-hṛdaya-sūtra*, and the *Thousand Sanskrit Words* 《梵语千字文》[T: Müller's original reads "*Thousand Sanskrit and Chinese Words*"]. These Sanskrit texts were believed to have come from the Hōryūji temple 法隆寺 of Japan. (Authors' note: "Horiusi" in Müller's original text. Its full name is "Hōryū Gakumon-ji" 法隆学问寺). (Müller, 1881, pp. 1-2) The temple is located at Ikaruga town 斑鸠町 in the Ikoma district 生驹郡 of Nara Prefecture 奈良县 and is believed to be built by Prince Umayado 厩戸皇子 (author's note: i.e. Prince Shōtoku 圣德太子). The temple was known in ancient times as the Ikaruga-ji, and is one of the seven major temples of the southern capital. Later on 2 August 1880, Nanjō Bunyū wrote to inform Müller that he received letter from his acquaintances in Japan searching for Sanskrit manuscripts at the Hōryūji that prior to the search, some of the significant cultural valuables including the Sanskrit *Heart Sūtra* had already been sent to the Imperial Court (author's note: record shows that in 1879 (11th Year of Meiji), Chihaya Jōchō 千早定朝 — head-priest of Hōryūji, relocated over 300 items of valuables to the Imperial Court out of safety consideration. These were first received at the Shōsō-in 正仓院, and later moved to the Imperial Museum at the Ueno Park of the Imperial Household Ministry, which became the National Museum after the Second World War.)

Nanjō's letter stated that the search party learned from a book entitled *Ikaruga koji benran* (*Memorandum on the Ancient Affairs of Ikaruga*) that among the valuables of the Hōryūji were: 1. a cymbal; 2. a water-vessel; 3. a staff; 4. a scarf worn by Bodhidharma; 5. a bowl belonging to Bodhidharma; and 6. palm-leaves of the (*Sarva-durgati-pariśodhana*)*-uṣṇīṣa-vijaya-dhāraṇī* and the *Prajñāpāramitā-hṛdaya-sūtra*. These items were said to have been transmitted via Hui Si 慧思 who lived in Nan Shan 南山 (author's note: Nien-shan, Nenzen, i.e. Nanyue 南嶽) [T: Müller's original words: "these things are said to have been in the procession of some Chinese priests, named Hwui-sz (Yeshi) and Nien-shan (Nenzen), and four others successively, who lived in a monastery on the mountain called Nan-yo …"]. In 609 CE when Prince Umayado was 37 (author's note: the birth year of the prince should be 574 CE, which is either the 29th or the 30th year of the reign of Emperor Suiko 推古天皇. So, the prince could not be 37 in 609 CE), the Emperor's retainer Imoko Ono 小野妹子 brought the items back to Japan from the Sui dynasty 隋朝. (Müller, 1881, pp. 4-5) Although the search party had not actually witnessed the palm leaves at that time, they did find a 17th century copy of these made by Priest Jōgon 净严 (1639-1702) who founded the Edo Reiun-ji 江戶灵云寺 of the Shingon Sect 真言宗. (Müller, 1881, pp. 5-6) Nanjō's letter also contained descriptions about the palm leaves but these are omitted here. The discovery of these Sanskrit manuscripts was also mentioned in Nanjō's own memoir, which is more colourful than scholarly and is short on details. (南條文雄, 1979, pp. 129-130)

At the same time, Müller also received a letter from the eminent diplomat Sir E. Satow informing him that on reading (account of) Müller's article, he sourced for Müller certain Sanskrit manuscripts including a 1694 copy of the Hōryūji *Heart Sūtra* by Preist Jōgon of the Edo Reiun-ji, as well as its transcription into Chinese and

Japanese. These written scrolls and copies of the *Heart Sūtra* were later classified as Catalogue Bodleian Japan Nos. 45b, 46a, 61, 62, 63. (Müller, 1881, pp. 10-11) Since the copyrights of the photographic edition of the above have now expired, they are now easily accessible on the Internet. They are written in the Siddham script in two leaves. The first leaf and the first line of the second leaf contain the *Heart Sūtra*; and the rest includes the *Uṣṇīṣa-vijaya-dhāraṇī* and a complete Sanskrit syllabary in Siddhaṃ 悉曇十四音.

After sourcing the above manuscripts Müller compiled them into a book (Müller, 1884) which includes the following: (1) the two texts mentioned above rewritten in Devanāgarī by Müller himself, their transcription by Jōgon, and two other copies of them; (pp. 5-8); (2) the title page of Jōgon's handwritten copy (translated into English by Nanjiō); (3) the following transcriptions of Jōgon's handwritten copy: in Devanāgarī script, in Roman script, in Roman script of his Chinese transcription, and in Roman script of his Japanese transcription; (pp. 17-22) (4) three other transcriptions of the Sanskrit *Heart Sūtra*; (pp. 28-30) (5) English translation of the long-form and the short-form *Heart Sūtra*, including a bilingual Devanāgar/Sanskrit translation of the short-form version (pp. 48-50), and a Devanāgarī transcription of the long-form *Heart Sūtra* purportedly transmitted by Jōkyō 常晓— disciple of Kukai 空海 (774-835 CE) (pp. 51-54) with English translation and explanation (now classified as Catalogue Bodleian Japan No. 63) (pp. 55-59). This edition is the collection of the Hasedera Temple 长谷寺— Headquarters of the Buzan School 丰山派 of the Shingon Sect 真言宗. Together with the Hōryūji edition, they are the two major and most well-known manuscripts of Sanskrit *Heart Sūtra* in Japan.

In the last part of his book, Müller appended an article entitled *Paleographic Remarks on the Hōryūji Palm-leaf Manuscript* by the eminent German Indologist and linguist Johann Georg Bühler (1837-1898) (pp. 63-95). This article is very important in relation to the historical dating of the Hōryūji Sanskrit *Heart Sūtra*. If the *Heart Sūtra* is indeed proven to be a manuscript of 609 CE or earlier

[T: according to the *Ikaruga* memorandum cited above] Nattier's speculation on Xuanzang's role [T: i.e. back-translation in 649 CE, see §2.2] would become baseless. Therefore Nattier also quoted Bühler's article in her work in her refutation of the claim that the Hōryūji *Heart Sūtra* was introduced (to Japan) in 609 CE (see n. 14).

Nattier's argument (presented in the footnote) is most persuasive. Linking the written scrolls with Bodhidharma the patriarch of Zen Buddhism is itself suspicious — in Zen legend, Bodhidharma himself is said to have close ties with the *Heart Sūtra*. (Cheng Zheng 程正, 2007) We should also take note of another very important point: this written scroll of the *Heart Sūtra* has also written on it the *Uṣṇīṣa-vijaya-dhāraṇī*《尊胜陀罗尼》, which only became popular after Tang. The earliest reliable translation of the *dhāraṇī* did not appear until 679 CE during the 4th Year of the Yi Feng reign of Tang 唐仪凤四年. It gradually became popular after 713 CE during the Kaiyuan reign of Emperor Xuan Zong 玄宗开元, and it was not until 776 CE in the 11th Year of the reign of Da Li of Emperor Dai Zong 代宗大历 that it became widely circulated. (Lin Yun Rou 林韵柔, 2008, pp. 154, 184, 177-178) (Liu Shu Fen 刘淑芬, 2008, pp. 5-6, 12) Considering the above, I personally feel that the historical date of the Hōryūji *Heart Sūtra* should be placed at 730-750 CE, or even later.

3) Edited by Shaku Hannya *释般若 (Hannya, 1992-3)

This is a long-form *Heart Sūtra* in Sanskrit/Tibetan not seen by me.

4) Edited by Suzuki (D.T. Suzuki, 1934, p. 190) (D.T. Suzuki, 1935, p. 27)

This is a short-form *Heart Sūtra*.

5) Other non-Chinese editions

In the following discussion I have omitted all the Chinese editions. Other non-Chinese resources of the *Heart Sūtra* can be found in Nattier's citation based on the works by Conze; I shall quote from her below. However, for more specific information please consult Conze's detailed bibliography:

"The Tibetan canon contains only the (long-form) *Heart Sūtra* usually found in both the Prajñāpāramitā and the Vajrayāna sections of the Kanjur (Derge nos. 21,531; Narthang nos. 26,476; Lhasa no. 26,499), though in the Peking Kanjur the text appears only in the Vajrayāna section (no. 160). Jonathan Silk is about to publish a critical edition of the Tibetan canonical (long-form) version. The (short-form) Tibetan text is now being prepared for publication by John McRae and myself; in the meantime see a preliminary note on the (short-form) published by Ueyama Daijun 上山大峻 in *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyu*, vol. 26 (1965), pp. 783-779 (where, however, the Dunhuang text has been substantially regularized to conform with the orthographic conventions of Classical Tibetan). The Mongolian Kanjur, following the format of the Tibetan Peking xylograph edition, includes the *Heart Sūtra* only in the Vajrayāna Division (Ligeti No.162) (author's note: this refers to the catalogue on the Kanjur by the well-known Hungarian Orientalist Lajos Ligeti (1902-1987)).

A Sogdian version of the *Heart Sūtra*, together with a barbarous rendition of the Sanskrit, has been edited by E. Benveniste in *Textes sogdiens*, Part 1 (Paris: Paul Geuthner, 1940, pp. 142-144).

An incomplete Khotanese version has recently been edited and translated by Prods Oktor Skjaervø; see *The Khotanese Hṛdayasūtra* in *A Green Leaf: Papers in Honour of Professor Jes P. Asmussen*, Acta Iranica Series 2, No. 28 (Leiden: E.J.Brill, 1988), pp. 157-171.

An Üghur (Turkish) version of the text has recently been discovered in the Berlin Turfan collection, but is as yet unpublished. According to Peter Zieme (cited in Silk, *op. cit.*, p. 71, n. 78) the text is an incomplete manuscript, translated into Üghur from the Chinese but possibly also with reference to the Tibetan." (Nattier, 1992, pp. 200-201, n. 1)

Beside his important bibliography, *The Prajñāpāramitā Literature* by Conze is also dotted with the author's findings on the *Heart Sūtra*. For example, he considered that the "Kumārajīva version" (T250) was in fact "translated by Kumārajīva's disciple", and also pointed out that it was not until 730 CE, in the *Kaiyuan Catalogue*《开元录》, that this version was associated with Kumārajīva's name for the first time. (Conze, *The Prajñāpāramitā Literature*, 2000a, p. 20) Furthermore, Conze compared the "Kumārajīva version" and the Xuanzang version and pointed out that the two texts were basically the same. However, the two texts translated technical terms like *skandha* differently, and the Xuanzang version omitted two passages in the "Kumārajīva version", as well as the word *mahāmantro* (author's note: meaning "great *dhāraṇī*"). As we can see, all these observations have provided Nattier with inspiration in her studies. As well, Conze noted that it was not until 741 CE that the long-form *Heart Sūtra* was first translated into the Chinese by the East Indian monk Dharmacandra 法月, i.e. the《普遍智藏般若波罗蜜多心经》(T252) (*Prajñāpāramitā-hṛdaya-sūtra — the Storehouse of Omniscience*) (Conze, *The Prajñāpāramitā Literature*, 2000a, p. 22). Such time-lag between short-form *Heart Sūtra* [T: the earlier Kumārajīva and Xuanzang versions] and long-form *Heart Sūtra* [T: the later Dharmacandra version] becomes the starting point of Nattier's logic in her consideration of the different Chinese and Indian criteria used to determine the authenticity of Buddhist texts [sic].

3.3 Special Article on the *Prajñāpāramitā-hṛdaya-sūtra*

Apart from the work mentioned above, Conze's research can mainly be found in his special article on the *Heart Sūtra* — *The Prajñāpāramitā-hṛdaya-sūtra*, first published in the *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* (pp. 38-51) in 1948, and later included in his *Thirty Years of Buddhist Studies*. (Conze, 2000b, pp. 148-167) Even after the appearance of Nattier's article, this is still probably the most important work — if not one of the most fundamental ones — in the studies of the *Heart Sūtra*.

The article began by listing a critical edition of the text (pp. 149-154). Sources included in this edition are: 12 Sanskrit manuscripts from Nepal (dating between 1164 and 1819); 7 Sanskrit manuscripts from China (including the well-known Chinese transliteration S2464 from Dunhuang [T: i.e. Stein Collection], and 6 others dating between 850 CE and the 17th century); the two previously mentioned Sanskrit editions from Japan: one from Hōryūji (edited by Müller) and one from the Hasedera Temple. Also consulted were: 7 Chinese translations and one Tibetan edition (long-form) from the Kanjur. This edition of Conze is a long-form version. As it was critically done, it is currently probably the most used and most convenient to use edition in the academic world.

Following the edited text, Conze pointed out the variant readings of the various editions. For example:

1) Where the Hōryūji edition (609 CE) reads *na prāptitvaṁ bodhisattvasya*, the Chinese translations — from that of Kumārajīva to that of Prajñācakra (智慧轮, 861 CE) — seem to have read *na prāpti / tasmād aprāptitvād bodhisattva(sya)* [T: 亦无得 / 以无所得 菩提萨埵] , which appears to have only developed in the course of time;

2) Kumārajīva and several other manuscripts know nothing of the clause [T: found in Nepalese manuscripts] *na vidyā na vidyākṣayo* (author's note: literally 无明，无明尽 or "no knowledge, no end of knowledge"). Please note that this clause is different to the double-negative form *na-avidyiā na-avidyiā-kṣayo* 无无明，亦无无明尽 or "no no-knowledge, and no no-end-of-knowledge" found in the translations of Kumārajīva and Xuanzang. In the Hōryūji edition, the complete form of this clause has an additional syllable '*a*', i.e. *na vidyā na-**a**vidyā na vidyākṣayo na-**a**vidyākṣayo* 无明，无无明，无明尽，无无明尽 or "no knowledge, no no-knowledge, no end of knowledge, no no end of knowledge", which is obviously different to Xuanzang's 无无明，亦无无明尽. I would also like researchers to note that this clause in the Dunhuang transliteration *Tangfan fandui ziyin boruo boluomi xin jing*《唐梵飜对字音般若波罗蜜多心经》(T256,

8.851c17-19) (thought to be the work of Xuanzang or Amoghavajra (705-774)) is: 曩尾儞也，曩尾儞也，曩尾儞也乞叉喻，曩尾儞也乞叉喻 [T: "*nang-myoix-ni-jax, nang-myoix-ni-jax, nang-myoix-ni-jax-khiot-chre-jyoh, nang-myoix-ni-jax-khiot-chre-jyoh*" (Middle Chinese Romanization 古韵罗马拼音 after www.zdic.net; final "*x*/*t*/*h*" denote tones), which corresponds to *na vidyā na-avidyā na vidyākṣayo na-avidyākṣayo*]. (Clearly) "*na-vidyā*" and "*na-avidyā*" have very different meanings in Sanskrit but this difference is lost in 曩尾儞也，曩尾儞也 where there is no way of distinguishing the short '*a*' from the long '*ā*'. This subtle point aside we can see that this edition has exactly the same reading as the Hōryūji and not the Xuanzang edition. Therefore, this presents quite an obstacle to Nattier's theory of back-translation. In other words, the Sanskrit edition she used to compare (with Xuanzang's translation made in Tang) [T: i.e. Conze's critical edition which reads: *na-avidyiā na-avidyiā-kṣayo*] is actually different to that circulated in Tang (i.e. T256) [T: which reads: *na vidyā na-avidyā na vidyākṣayo na-avidyākṣayo*]. Thus, her word-for-word comparison is really incomparable;

3) Also found in a few manuscripts is *na-amārgāḥ* (author's note: literally 无无道 or "no no-path"). In six Nepalese editions and in Feer's polyglot edition (17th century?), this clause follows immediately behind *na duḥkha-samudaya-nirodha-mārgā* 无苦集灭道;

4) Similarly only in a few Sanskrit manuscripts is *na-prāptiḥ* followed by *na-aprāptiḥ*, which appears quite late in the Chinese translations (author's note: *na-prāptiḥ* is 无得 or "no gain" and *na-aprāptiḥ* 无无得 or "no no-gain". In early translations only 无得 appears after 无智 *na jñānaṃ* or "no wisdom"), but Dunhuang Fa Cheng 法成 edition (856 CE) reads: 无智无得，亦无不得 or "no wisdom, no gain, and no no-gain". One other major difference has escaped the attention of both Conze and Nattier: In the Dunhuang transliteration T256, following 无得 is the clause 曩鼻娑么 (*nang-bjiih-sax-muax*), rendered 拏毕三磨野 (*nra-pid-sam-mua-jax*) [T: Middle Chinese Romanization 古韵罗马拼音 after www.zdic.net, final "*x*/*h*" denote tones] in Ci Xian's 慈賢 transliteration found in the Fang Shan Stone Carving Collection 房山石经藏. In Sanskrit, this

clause would read *na-abhisamya* meaning “no clear realization” 无现解 or “no clear understanding” 无现观. Thus, we know that these two Sanskrit transliterations, both very old, do not match Xuanzang’s translation word-for-word either [T: i.e. without *na-abhisamya*]. As an aside, Fukui Fumimasa 福井文雅 explained that *na-abhisamya* is an interlinear note 夾注 for *na-prāptiḥ*. I find it rather odd that Sanskrit transliteration would be used for notation purposes, and I therefore remain unconvinced; (福井文雅, 1985, p. 244)

5) In some editions (author’s note: mainly three later ones after the 17th century) *cittāvaraṇa* reads *cittālambaṇa* instead. Literally, *cittāvaraṇa* means 心无障碍 (“mind without obstruction”), but in earlier Chinese translations, this is 心无罣碍 (“mind with no hindrance”), which is closer to *cittālambaṇa*. I find (Conze’s speculation on this) hardly necessary. If we go by the transliterated (Sanskrit) manuscripts, we see that the Dunhuang Stone Cave Collection edition reads 只哆嚩啰拏 (*cje-thra-po-luo-na*), while Amoghavajra’s edition reads 唧哆阿嚩啰拏 (*cit-thra-qa-po-luo-na*) [T: Middle Chinese Romanization 古韵罗马拼音 after www.zdic.net, final “*t*” denotes tones]. In Chinese transliteration *luo* 啰 is often used to denote “*r*”. This, together with the dates of these transliterated manuscripts, indicates that the Sanskrit editions around the time of Tang should read *cittāvaraṇa*.

Apart from the above variant readings mentioned by Conze, we also find other anomalies if we compare the various Sanskrit versions with Xuanzang’s translation. For example in both the Kumārajīva and Xuanzang translations we find the clause 度一切苦厄(“transcends all afflictions”), which is absent from the Sanskrit transliterations mentioned above. Strangely, the clause is also absent from all extant Sanskrit versions. However, (a similar clause) 离诸苦厄 (“away from various afflictions”) can be found in the Chinese translations by Bo Re(般若) and Li Yan(利言) (T253) and Prajñācakra (智慧轮) (T254). In this regard, if the extant Sanskrit version is indeed back-translated by Xuanzang or others, then why is this clause missing? This is very perplexing indeed.

There is also the variant reading used by Nattier in her very persuasive argument, namely, *rūpān na pṛthak śūnyatā śūnyatāya na pṛthag rūpaṁ* found in most Sanskrit *Heart Sūtra*, and correspond word-for-word to the Chinese 色不异空，空不异色 ("form is not other than emptiness, emptiness is not other than form"). The variant reading of this is *na rūpaṁ pṛthak śūnyatāyāḥ nāpi śūnyatā na pṛthag rūpat* found in two later-day Sanskrit manuscripts [T: probably 17th century (Conze, 2000b, p 150, nn. 11-12)]. In Chinese translation this reads: 非空异於色，也非空不异於色 ("not that emptiness is other than form, and not that emptiness is not other than form"). Not only do the two variant readings mean differently, such discrepancy also diminishes the likelihood of a Sanskrit back-translation from Chinese since we cannot completely rule out the possibility that these two (17th century) manuscripts existed earlier — at least not until otherwise proven.

And I like to emphasize here that we should note that *rūpān na pṛthak śūnyatā śūnyatāya na pṛthag rūpaṁ* is a very awkward word-for-word (back)-translation of 色不异空，空不异色. This is because if we just pay attention to the Sanskrit word order for now, we can see an exact correspondence of *rūpān* to 色, *na* to 不, *pṛthak* to 异, *śūnyatā* to 空, *śūnyatāya* to 空, *na* to 不, *pṛthag* to 异, and *rūpaṁ* to 色, thus giving an exact match to Xuanzang's translation. The problem is, anyone with a little Sanskrit knowledge can see that if the sentence is analysed, it will show a word order that is exactly the opposite. While word order is very important in Chinese syntax, it is relatively less important in Sanskrit and Pāli, whose syntax relies on the gender, number and case of the words involved instead. For these languages, word order is not rigidly applied even though a subject-object format of a sentence is preferred, and different word orders may result in sandhi issues. Here, I will analyse the first half of the sentence (for simplification, I will not go into all the grammatical explanations regarding sandhi, gender and number): *rūpān* is in ablative case, i.e. "from form", *na* is an indeclinable word, *pṛthak* is also indeclinable meaning "different (from), other than" when used with an ablative, and *śūnyatā* is in nominative case. So, literally, the clause means 空不异於色（"emptiness is not different from form"), which is a complete opposite to Xuanzang's 色不异空. For the second half of the sentence this situation is the same. Therefore, if the Sanskrit sentence was indeed back-translated by Xuanzang, we can be sure that he would have reversed its word order instead of making such a minor [sic] mistake. We have no grounds to assume that given his Sanskrit knowledge, Xuanzang's was unclear about such basic grammar.

There is yet another point. Nattier noticed that the way "form is not other than emptiness and emptiness is not other than form" is expressed in the Sanskrit *Large Sūtra* is completely different to the Sanskrit *Heart Sūtra* — especially the Sanskrit expression for "other than". (Wu Ru Jun 吴汝鈞, 1992, p. 394) In this regard, Nattier did not mention that *anya* (used in the *Large Sūtra*) and not *pṛthak* (used in the *Heart Sūtra*) is the more common expression for "variance" or "difference" in Sanskrit — at least in Prajñāpāramitā literature if not in general Buddhist texts. In his days or even to this day, no one other than Xuanzang, who has translated the massive *Da boruo jing*《大般若经》from Sanskrit into Chinese, is more familiar with the entire Prajñāpāramitā literature in these two languages. If he was indeed the one who back-translated the *Heart Sūtra*, he would undoubtedly have easily brought to mind the standard usage (i.e. *anya*) repeated numerous times in the entire Prajñāpāramitā literature, instead of finding an alternative translation that sounds awkward. Lin Guang Ming 林光明 has summarized 21 differences between the Sanskrit *Heart Sūtra* and the Xuanzang version. Apart from some minor points of little relevance, some of these are worthy of our attention. (林光明, 2004, pp. 318-321)

Leaving aside for now the differences pointed out by Lin Guan Ming, what my above analysis as well as the differences between the Xuanzang *Heart Sūtra* and the Sanskrit version show, are more than sufficient for me to strongly question the claim that Xuanzang translated the *Heart Sūtra* into Sanskrit.

In this regard another case which Nattier used as proof of back-translation is 无眼界，乃至无意识界 in Xuanzang's edition. This is yet another case of complete match with the abbreviated *na cakṣur-dhātur yāvan na mano-vijñāna-dhātuḥ* in the Sanskrit *Heart Sūtra* of, and also in Kumārajīva's Chinese *Large Sūtra*, but not in the Sanskrit *Large Sūtra* itself. But in fact in a 17th century Sanskrit manuscript, all the 18 *dhātus* have been listed, and in two Sanskrit manuscripts from Nepal, the listing is even much more detailed and cumbersome.

From the brief presentation of the Sanskrit versions given above, we can also see that even if the Sanskrit *Heart Sūtra* is indeed Xuanzang's back-translation from Chinese, it is not itself a one-off, immutable product but is rather subject to a process of change. And if the Sanskrit *Heart Sūtra* is indeed a Chinese back-translation, its later inclusion of an opening and a closing section to make it look more like a Buddhist text on the one hand, and the addition of typical Indian cultural elements such as the increasing use of more cumbersome items mentioned above on the other hand, will make the text look more Indian.

Thereafter Conze's devoted himself to finding the literal correspondence between the main body of the *Heart Sūtra* and the larger Prajñāpāramitā texts. Although he managed to conclude that the former was an abridged extract of the relevant chapters of the large Sanskrit text *Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikā-prajñāpāramitā-sūtra*《二万五千颂般若经》(Conze, 2000b, pp. 158-160), he unfortunately failed to make the association for realizing that the Chinese translation of this large text, i.e. Kumārajīva's *Large Sūtra*, is the main source for the Chinese *Heart Sūtra* translated by Kumārajīva and by Xuanzang. This is the realization that has led Nattier to wonder: Why is there word-for-word correspondence between Xuanzang's Chinese *Heart Sūtra* and Kumārajīva's Chinese *Large Sūtra*, but huge differences between the Sanskrit *Large Sūtra* and the Sanskrit *Heart Sūtra*? Although it was Nattier who provided the answer to the question, it was Conze's editorial work comparing the Sanskrit *Heart Sūtra* with the *Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikā* (on which Kumārajīva's Chinese *Large Sūtra* is based) that provided Nattier with the very important basis of her research. We can at least say Conze's edition has saved Nattier, and of course the rest of us, the troubles of identifying the corresponding texts in the original texts.

In the rest of his article Conze focused mainly on the studies of the ideas promulgated in the *Heart Sūtra* in comparison with those in the other Prajñāpāramitā texts. As a result, he concluded that the *Heart Sūtra* is a condensation of the larger Prajñāpāramitā texts, as a restatement, for beginners, the fundamental Buddhist tenants of Four Noble Truths. Seen in the historical perspective of the development of Buddhism, it is the *dharma-cakra-pravartana-sūtra* 《转法轮经》of the new dispensation.

We see from the above analysis that Conze had found passages in the Sanskrit *Heart Sūtra* that were parallel to the Sanskrit *Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikā*, and had analysed their similarities or otherwise. He was aware that the latter was the basis for Kumārajīva's Chinese *Large Sūtra*, and had also partially compared their similarities and differences. It is a pity that he did not take the further step of examining the relationship between Kumārajīva's Chinese *Heart Sūtra* and Xuanzang's Chinese *Heart Sūtra*; nor the step of asking why the two Chinese translations, while corresponding word-for-word to each other, should refer to different Sanskrit texts? Taking these missing steps was precisely what Nattier did. She thereby provided a reasonable explanation for the logic behind the causal relationship of the texts involved. And the breakthrough came, as Nattier herself explained, not from intra-textual but (cross-lingual) inter-textual studies. This point, I think, serves as a profound guiding principle to our future work in Buddhist philology. By ignoring cross-lingual work, we could be prevented by our methodology from fulfilling our hope of significant breakthroughs that may only be a step away, even if we are endowed with multi-lingual editorial talent, and have made significant contribution in certain area of research, like Conze.

4. Research by Hurvitz and others

Apart from Conze's works, the other relatively major Western academic studies on the *Heart Sūtra* are mainly found in a monograph edited by Lewis Lancaster in memory of Conze (Lancaster, 1977). Of the 22 articles it has collected all except four are studies on Prajñāpāramitā texts, grouped under their classification. In the third group, there are five articles all dedicated to the studies on the *Prajñāpāramitā-hṛdaya-sūtra: Hsuan-tsang and the Heart Scripture* by Leon Hurvitz; (pp. 103-121) *The Heart Sutra in Japanese Context* by Michael Pye; (pp. 123-134) *Secret of the Heart Sutra* by Alex Wayman; (pp. 135-152) *Mahāprajñāpāramitā Sūtra* by Sir H.W.Bailey, (pp. 153-162) and *A Study of a Khotanese prajñāpāramitā text: After the Work of Sir Harold Bailey* by Lancaster himself. (pp. 163-183)

Hurvitz's article begins with a complete English translation of Xuanzang's *Heart Sūtra* and has included the prefaces found in the Taishō canon written by the First Ming Emperor Tai Zhu 明太祖 and Hui Zhong 慧忠 of Nanyang 南阳. (pp. 104-108) Following this is his translation of the entire *Tangfan fandui ziyin boruo boluomi xin jing*《唐梵翻对字音般若波罗蜜多心经並序》[T: T256, a Chinese transliteration], which has similarly included a very important preface, which mentions the story of Xuanzang meeting a sick monk in Yi Zhou 益州 of Sichuan, who instructed him on the *Heart Sūtra*. The same monk was to reappear to Xuanzang at the Nālandā Vihāra in India, and told him he was himself the Avalokiteśvara. We can see that this part of Hurvitz's article has likewise much inspired Nattier in her studies. Hurvitz then attempted to reinstate, with little success, the mantra following the preface — *Universal Praise of the Three Jewels of Lotus and Other Maṇḍala*《莲花部等普赞叹三宝》. The final part of the article is the Sanskrit restoration of the Chinese transliteration of this Dunhuang *Heart Sūtra* [T: Stein Collection S700] into Sanskrit. (pp. 110-112) This part of the particle has been rather fully utilized by Nattier in her article. For more review on Hurvitz's article, please refer to the comments by Professor Wan Jin Chuan. (万金川, 2004a, pp. 102-103)

The second article — *The Heart Sutra in Japanese Context*, is not too relevant to our discussion and is therefore omitted here. If it has any reference value, it is the fact that the author pointed out that in Japan the only popular version of the *Heart Sūtra* is likewise the Xuanzang version; (p. 130) and the reason for its popularity is its *dhāraṇī*, which makes the text more accessible to the common folks. (p. 131) No doubt we can learn something from these two points in our understanding of the popularization of the *Heart Sūtra* in China's context.

The situation with the third article is the same. But here we need to take note that Wayman's article quoted Suzuki Daisetzu 鈴木大拙 as saying: "We can be certain that Avalokiteśvara 观世音 has never appeared in any Prajñāpāramitā sutras"; (p. 135) a comment, I think, that must have been very inspirational to Nattier, for this is one of the points she raised when she talks about the few unusual features of the *Prajñāpāramitā-hṛdaya-sūtra*. This ("absence of the Avalokiteśvara") is of course not the case, and I will return in §8.6 to discuss the importance of this figure in Prajñāpāramitā texts during the period of tantric influence. The remaining two articles are completely irrelevant to Nattier's work and are omitted from our discussion here.

5. Research by Lopez, Jr.

Nattier has also benefited from the *The Heart Sūtra Explained: Indian and Tibetan Commentaries* (ALBANY: State University of New York Press, 1988) by Donald S. Lopez, Jr. This book is part of the monograph series on Buddhist studies edited by Kenneth Inada. Lopez, Jr. (1952-). Lopez, Jr. is currently Professor of Buddhism and Tibetan Studies in the Department of Asian Languages and Cultures, University of Michigan, and an internationally acclaimed Tibetologist. This book has been reprinted in India (Delhi: Sri Satguru Publications, 1990), which is the least expensive and most usable edition. It is divided into two parts: Indian Commentaries (pp. 19-136) and Tibetan Commentaries (pp. 139-186) on the *Heart*

Sūtra. Included in the first part is an overview of the entire *Heart Sūtra*, which also discusses certain questionable issues about the text.

In the opening chapter, Lopez, Jr. pointed out that the aim of his book was to examine the contemporary understanding of the *Heart Sūtra* as reflected in its commentarial literature during the Pāla Dynasty (750-1199). A particular point to note is that the author pointed out that all Indian commentaries on the *Heart Sūtra* were written at about this time. So, if we accept Conze's determination of 350 CE as the historical date of the text, then there is obviously be a gap of about 500 years between it and its commentaries. (p. 4) [T: the author does not consider "350 CE" the correct date, see §3.1, 3]. Although Lopez made this noteworthy point (about Indian commentaries), he himself had let it slipped without pursuing it further. It was Nattier who made this an important point in sustaining her argument that the Sanskrit *Heart Sūtra* is a back-translation from Chinese.

In his analysis of the *Heart Sūtra*, Lopez, Jr. pointed out that in early Prajñāpāramitā literature, the speaker was often Subhūti and not the Buddha, let alone Avalokiteśvara. He remarks that the *Heart Sūtra* is the only major Prajñāpāramitā work in which Avalokiteśvara made an appearance, and his appearance is yet another sign that the text belongs to a relatively late date, written after the worship of Avalokiteśvara the *bodhisattva* has been fully established. (p. 7) As mentioned before, this observation has been very inspirational to Nattier. When Lopez, Jr. analysed the *dhāraṇī* included at the end of the text, he came to the similar conclusion that it shows that the scripture was completed at a relatively late date. (p. 8)

Having respectively discussed the Indian commentaries on the *Heart Sūtra*, the author again pointed out that the reasons why earlier commentaries were lacking was probably due to India's monsoon seasons [sic]; Islamic invasions and so on; or perhaps they simply did not exist in the first place since they were never quoted by many of the early Mahāyāna *abhidharmas*. It was not until Xuanzang's time that records began to emerge. (pp. 12-13) Why then did the Indians take a sudden interest on this text during the Pāla Dynasty?

To this question, the author's answer was that: many of the Indian commentarial works had something to do with Tibet [T: i.e. Tibetan preferences], (namely,) the *Heart Sūtra* contains many elements worthy of consideration: it is very short and easy to recite; it contains the fundamental Buddhist teachings; it provides its teachings an openness of interpretation; and it has a *dhāraṇī* that is attractive to followers of Tibetan Vjrayāna. (p. 13)

We can see from the above that simply by studying the timing of the Sanskrit and Tibetan commentaries of the *Heart Sūtra*, Lopez, Jr. was faced with the question: Why did the commentaries appear so late? But since he did not place his work on the footing of a comprehensive cross-lingual study, Lopez, Jr. was unable to advance his work one step further like what Nattier did. Once again, we should take note from this the importance of cross-lingual study, as a methodology, to Buddhist philology.

6. Research by Fukui Fumimasa 福井文雅 with Comments

Another academic source that has exerted a relatively major influence on Nattier's work comes from Fukui Fumimasa (1934-): a Japanese monk of the Tendai Sect and a very active, heavy-weight Buddhist scholar in contemporary Japan. One of Fukui's fields of research is the *Heart Sūtra*, the work of which is mainly reflected in the following two books published by the Shunjusha Publishing Company 春秋社: *Studies on the History of the Prajñāpāramitā-hṛdaya-sūtra* 《般若心経の歴史研究》in 1987, and *A Comprehensive Study of the Prajñāpāramitā-hṛdaya-sūtra — History, Society, References*《般若心経の総合研究》歴史·社会·资料》published in 2000. In addition, the various views of Fukui on the *Heart Sūtra* that are relevant to Nattier's work can be found in his article *The Changing Perspectives of the Prajñāpāramitā-hṛdaya-sūtra in China*《般若心经观在中国的变迁》translated into Chinese by Guo Zi De 郭自得 and Guo Chang Cheng 郭长城 published in No.6 of the 1983 issue of the *Journal of Dunhuangology*《敦煌学》of the Centre for the Studies of Chinese Literature of the Chinese Culture University of Taiwan.

One of the very important views of the 1983 article is that while *Xin jing*《心经》the Chinese title of the *Heart Sūtra* is commonly considered to carry the meaning of "essence", the title in the Tang period is not *Xin jing* but *Ta xin jing*《多心经》[T: 多 pronounced "*ta*" in Middle Chinese ("*duo*" in modern pinyin)]. In fact, *Ta xin jing* is also the title adopted by Buddhist scriptural catalogues in general. This is what Fukui found after consulting the Dunhuang manuscripts; the written documents of the Shōsō-in 正仓院 in Japan; and the scriptural catalogues of Tang. Fukui first examined the way the Dunhuang manuscripts were titled. They have in their titles (the character 多) such as *Ta xin jing*《多心经》, *Foshuo ta xin jing*《佛说多心经》, *Boruo ta xin jing*《般若多心经》, *Foshuo boruo ta xin jing*《佛说般若多心经》, *Ta xin boruo jing*《多心般若经》, *Guanyin ta xin jing*《观音多心经》, *Boluomi ta xin jing*《波罗蜜多心经》, *Mi ta xin jing*《蜜多心经》and so on. Only two manuscripts were found to have the title *Xin jing*《心经》(without the extra character 多), and both are most likely later addition and not contemporaneous. Fukui then examined the scriptural catalogues of the time; the written documents of the Shōsō-in; even the Hōryūji edition of the Sanskrit *Heart Sūtra* mentioned above, and found most to have *Ta xin jing*《多心经》as their titles. This situation continues well after Tang. Fukui's view can indeed be supported by evidence found in Chinese philology, and the situation is in fact time-sensitive, with the title *Xin jing*《心经》becoming more common as written manuscripts are gradually replaced by printed ones. Nevertheless the common usage of this title would seem to have taken hold only after the 14th century. (Fukui, 1983, pp. 18-20) Many modern scholars take it for granted that (the difference in the titles *Ta xin jing* and *Xin jing*) is a case of mistaken break a string of words. This view has persisted in the academic world even to this day, many years after the publication of Fukui's article. (Lin Guang Ming 林光明, 2004, p. 44)

What then is the original meaning of the title *Ta xin jing*? Using as an example the different translations of the title of the *Bukong juansuo shenzhou xin jing*《不空羂索神咒心经》(*Amoghapāśa-hṛdaya-*

dhāraṇī), Fukui found that 心 (“heart”) was interchangeable with 咒 (*vidyā*), 陀罗尼 or 真言 (*dhāraṇī*), and he concluded that 心 had in fact the meaning of mantra. (pp. 22-25) Fukui also found that in scriptural catalogues, *dhāraṇī sūtra*《陀罗尼经》and *Heart Sūtra* 心经 were interchangeable terms, and in the catalogues of sutras in Tang— except fascicle five of the *Neidian*《大唐內典录》(*Catalogue of Buddhist Texts in Great Tang*)— and also in the catalogues found among the Shōsō-in documents, *Ta xin jing* was classified as being in the same group as *dhāraṇī* and *vidyā*, and these were treated alike for cataloguing purposes. This situation is further supported by the fact that *Ta xin jing* among the Dunhuang manuscripts are found to be included in the collection of *mahā-vidyā* 大明咒藏. (pp. 25-26) Later in §8.4 when I talked about the way Sanskrit *Heart Sūtra* is titled, I will point out that “*xin*” 心 (“heart”) and “*tuo luo ni*” 陀罗尼 (*dhāraṇī*) belong to the same series of concepts. Precisely because 心 equates to 陀罗尼, many texts of the time have “*Heart Sūtra*” in their titles. In order to distinguish them from the *Heart Sūtra* (*Prajñāpāramitā-hṛdaya-sūtra*), their titles were given the extra character 多 (“*ta*”), taken from the last syllable of *prajñāpāramitā*.

Lastly Fukui pointed out that except for the intelligentsia minority who would regard the *Heart Sūtra* as the embodiment of the Prajñāpāramitā idea of “emptiness”, the text was worshipped by the overwhelming majority of Tang followers as a mystical mantra. In other words *Ta xin jing* is associated with the belief which has, as its core, a mystical mantra. Later on after the Song period, with the fading of tantric influence and the rise of Zen Buddhism, the title *Ta xin jing*《多心经》was eventually replaced by *Xin jing*《心经》.

From the brief introduction above we can see that Fukui’s views have resolved a major issue for Nattier, who maintained that the Chinese *Heart Sūtra* is a scripture produced in China; who also wondered why the production did not follow the general practice of the locals by adding elements to make it more resembling a Buddhist text— such as giving it the complete genre comprising an introductory section, a core section and a concluding section— and the introduction of

Indian elements and so on. If there was a (Chinese) producer, why more efforts were not taken to make it better resemble a Buddhist text? Fukui's studies have provided Nattier the answer she would have hoped for, namely, the *Heart Sūtra*, instead of being a Buddhist scripture, is only a dhāraṇī.

We should note that apart from the reasons given by Fukui above, there is yet another important one for explaining why *Ta xin jing* in Tang was the common title rather than *Xin jing*. The reason is: *Ta xin jing* refers to the Xuanzang version of the *Prajñāpāramitā-hṛdaya-sūtra*, which in his days, has the term "*prajñāpāramitā*" translated as *bo-re-bo-luo-mi-ta* 般若波罗蜜多, whereas this term in the (earlier) Kumārajīva version is translated as *bo-re-bo-luo-mi* 般若波罗蜜 without the extra character 多 ("*ta*"). This change came about, as pointed out by Wan Jin Chuan 万金川, leading Taiwanese scholar on Buddhist linguistics, because the Middle Chinese sound for 蜜 is analogous to "*mĭĕt*", whereas in modern phonology (of Tang), this word loses its terminal "*t*" sound (in entering tone 入声) to pronounce "*mui*". Therefore, in the later (Tang) translation by Xuanzang (which drops its "*t*" sound) an extra character 多 ("*ta*") needs to be added in order to transliterate "*tā*" in the Sanskrit *prajñāpāramitā*. (万金川, 2004b, pp. 90-91) Thus we need to bear in mind that *Ta xin jing* is in fact none other than the Xuanzang translation.

Even so, many issues remain unanswered. If *Xin jing*《心经》is commonly known as *Ta xin jing*《多心经》in Tang, then why are there exceptions in the *Biography of Xuanzang*《慈恩传》written by Huili 慧立 and others, where the title of fascicles one and nine both reads Boruo xin jing《般若心经》? (Huili/Yancong, 慧立、彦悰, 2000, pp. 16, 202). It is also not uncommon to find the title *Boruo xin jing* in the *Kaiyuan Catalogue*《开元录》and in the records of the journeys by Japanese monks to China during Tang in search of sutras. How do we explain both these discrepancies? For now I have no answer and can only await the enlightenment by those who are in the know.

A sidenote: On the night of 26 January, 2012, Ken Su 苏锦坤 suggested in his written communication with me that just as for the word *jhāna* (meditation, 禅定), 禅 (*chan*) is its sound and 定 its meaning; for the word *kṣama* (penance, 忏悔), 忏 (*chan*) is its sound and 悔 its meaning [T: *kṣama*: "forbearance"; *kṣamāpaya* "asking for pardon"]; for the word *kṣetra* (land 刹土), 刹 (*sha*) is its sound and 土 its meaning; "*ta xin*" 多心 can likewise be explained as being made up of 多 ("*ta*") for the sound of *dhāraṇī* and 心 (heart) for its meaning. These suggestions are worth bearing in mind but there is one problem: We need to find philological proofs for associating 多 with *dhāraṇī*, but so far I am unable to locate any (see §8.4). On the other hand, we can find no examples in the Sanskrit title of the *Heart Sūtra* where the word *dhāraṇī* precedes *hṛdaya* (heart 心); it is always the other way round. So, if 多 ("*ta*") is for the sound of *dhāraṇī*, (and *hṛdaya* precedes *dhāraṇī* in the title) we would expect the Chinese title to read *Xin ta jing*《心多经》[T: h*ṛdaya-dhāraṇī-sūtra*] instead of (the usual Chinese title) *Ta xin jing*《多心经》[T: *dhāraṇī-hṛdaya-sūtra*].

7. Research by Shen Jiu Cheng

Prompted by Professor Fang Guang Chang 方广锠 and assisted by Ken Su of Taiwan in providing reference material, I reviewed the articles by Shen Jiu Cheng published in issues 195 and 196 of *Neiming Journal*《内明》of Hong Kong entitled *Commentary on the Prajñāpāramitā-hṛdaya-sūtra — Part I and II*《般若波罗蜜心经疏义》（一）、（二）. (沈九成, 1988) Further search shows that there is also a Part III published in pp. 3-8 of issue 206 dated May 1989 but I have not been able to see it to this day.

Of the first two articles that are available, what is original and of value is only the first (even here, it is only the introduction that is of value, at least to our current discussion). Judging by this article alone, Shen has shown some obvious errors, or some lack of rigour to say the least, in his writing; due perhaps to his lack of systematic academic training. Within the scope of this current article, the author has also shown that he lacks the necessary knowledge in foreign languages, and is less familiar with studies done abroad. Even so, some of the author's judgement and conjectures, derived from his academic intuition perhaps, are still a surprise to me. I believe someone like Shen, who is on the fringe of the academic circle, will definitely be out of the sight of a scholar like Nattier, whose first language is not Chinese. However, there are a few observations in Shen's articles that have predated Nattier's. Although the author's conjectures and arguments are less rigorous than Nattier's, his work still deserves our respect.

Almost right from the start Shen pointed out that the *Zhou jing* 《咒经》(author's note: i.e. Kumārajīva's translation of the *Heart Sūtra*) [T: T250, so-called, see §2.5] and the *Xin jing*《心经》(author's note: i.e. Xuanzang's translation of the *Heart Sūtra*) are 咒 (*vidyā*) and not "经" (*sūtra*), and the most important distinguishing feature is the presence or otherwise of the genre comprising an introductory, core and concluding sections. (沈九成, 1988, p.5)

Shen further pointed out that: "*Xin jing* is named after *Boruo fomu xinzhou*《般若佛姆心咒》, where "*xin*" ("心") has the meaning of "*xin zhou*" (心咒 or "*hṛdaya-vidyā*"). At the end of the Sanskrit *Heart Sūtra* is the wording: *prajñāpāramitā hṛdaya(i)ṃ samāptaṃ* [T: *prajñāpāramitā hṛdayaṃ* is concluded], where *hṛdayaṃ* can be translated as: "*xin*" (心 or "heart"), "*zhen yan*" (真言 or *dhāraṇī*), "*xin zhou*" (心咒 or *hṛdaya-vidyā*) and so on." Although the making of this statement is not rigorous enough, for instance *hṛdayaiṃ* [sic] strangely takes on a suffix [sic], his point about it having the meaning of *vidyā* 咒語 does echo the view of Fukui Fumimasa across the distance of time.

Shen also remarked: "whether (the Kumārajīva) *Zhou jing* 《咒经》has any original Sanskrit text is to date a moot point". He later pointed out that it probably has no Sanskrit original, and is thus distinct from the Xuanzang's *Xin jing* which does have one. Shen went on to remark that: "*Xin jing*, considered by learned monks from long ago to be the essence, is never found in (Xuanzang's) 600-fascicle '*Large Sūtra*'《大经》[T: i.e. T220,《大般若经》(*Da boruo jing*)]. And in the Mo jing《摩经》(author's note: i.e. Kumārajīva's '*Large Sūtra*') [T: i.e. T223, *Mohe boruo boluomi jing*《摩诃般若波罗蜜经》] *Zhou jing*《咒经》[T: T250] is not found. Why? This is because *Zhou jing* has no independent Sanskrit original." (沈九成, 1988, p. 6)

Shen went on to compare the parallels between Kumārajīva's translation the *Heart Sūtra* [T: T250] and his translation the *Large Sūtra* [T: T223], and pointed out their inter-relationship. Especially noteworthy is that Shen also examined the source of the mantras in the Kumārajīva's *Heart Sūtra* [T: T250] and Xuanzang's *Heart Sūtra* [T: T251] and was able to trace them back to the *Boruo fomu xinzhou*《般若佛姆心咒》included in the 600-fascicle *Da boruo jing*《大般若经》translated by Xuanzang:

𑖝(ta) 怛 𑖟𑖿𑖧(dya) 耶 𑖞𑖯(thā) 他 𑖌𑖽(oṃ) 唵 𑖐(ga) 伽 𑖝𑖸(te) 帝
𑖐(ga) 伽 𑖝𑖸(te) 帝 𑖢(pa) 鉢 𑖨(ra) 囉 𑖐(ga) 伽 𑖝𑖸(te) 帝 𑖢(pa)
鉢 𑖨(ra) 囉 𑖭𑖽(saṃ) 僧 𑖐(ga) 伽 𑖝𑖸(te) 帝 𑖤𑖺(bo) 菩 𑖠𑖰(dhi) 提
𑖭𑖿𑖪𑖯(svā) 薩嚩 𑖮𑖯(hā) 訶(T.07,1110a)

This discovery has not been made by any scholar in the past. Even though this mantra shows some variations compared to that in the *Heart Sūtra*, the discovery is still important. In later discussion, I will point out that the source of the mantra is actually the *Boruo daxin tuoluoni*《般若大心陀罗尼》by Atikūṭa 阿地瞿多. The main bodies of the above mantra and the *Heart Sūtra* mantra are identical in Sanskrit, but the two mantras also display two clear differences: One, the initial word "*oṃ*" in the *Boruo fomu xinzhou* mantra is absent in the *Heart Sūtra* mantra; Two, for their main bodies the two mantras used completely different Chinese transliterations. [T: the *Heart Sūtra* mantra (T251, 848c22) reads: 揭(ga) 帝(te) 揭(ga) 帝(te) 般(pa) 罗(ra) 揭(ga) 帝(te) 般(pa) 罗(ra) 僧(saṃ) 揭(ga) 帝(te) 菩(bo) 提(dhi) 萨婆/僧莎 (svā) 诃(hā)]. The discovery is important in that it clarifies two things: One, the mantra found in the *Heart Sūtra* already existed in other Prajñāpāramitā texts; Two, whether Xuanzang's *Heart Sūtra* is a translation or not, he could not have been its translator because it is unlikely and unnecessary that he would have transliterated an identical mantra using differing sets of Chinese words.

Having compared the mantras, Shen reached two conclusions: One, the *Zhou jing*《咒经》[T: i.e. Kumārajīva's *Heart Sūtra*] has no independent original Sanskrit text; Two, the reason why neither Kumārajīva's *Large Sūtra*《大经》nor Xuanzang's *Da boruo jing*《大般若经》has respectively included Kumārajīva's *Heart Sūtra* and Xuanzang's *Heart Sūtra* in them is because both versions of *Heart Sūtra* "have no independent Sanskrit original text".

Shen also compared the translation style of the two *Heart Sūtra* versions and concluded that: "by Xuanzang's usual style his *Xin jing*《心经》should have been much lengthier than Kumārajīva's *Zhou jing*《咒经》but the fact is: it is more concise." Some passages in the Xuanzang version were found to be deletion, reduction or re-wording of Kumārajīva's text. More importantly Shen found that "no ignorance and no end-of-ignorance" 无无明，亦无无明尽 in the Kumārajīva version (*Zhou jing*《咒经》), which has already been changed to "no arising of ignorance, no ending of ignorance" 无无明生，无无明灭 in Xuanzang's *Da boruo jing*《大般若经》, once again reads: "no ignorance and no end-of-ignorance" 无无明，亦无无明尽 in the so-called Xuanzang version (*Xin jing*《心经》). This therefore "indicates that *Xin jing*《心经》is re-written on the basis of *Zhou jing*《咒经》, and not translated from an independent Sanskrit text."

If one does not find such claims enough to generate surprises, there is the author's further inference as follows: "In terms of the time the works were produced, Xuanzang's *Xin jing* was 240 over years later than Kumārajīva's *Zhou jing*. It is not at all impossible that there is first the translation from Chinese into Sanskrit, and later from Sanskrit back into Chinese." In other words, Shen pointed out directly here that the Sanskrit version of the *Xin jing* is a translation from Chinese into Sanskrit. (沈九成, 1988, p. 8) We can see from the above that the way it is done, Shen's inference is by no means as thorough as Nattier's. However, his article has indeed provided us with some most valuable observations.

8. The *Heart Sūtra* Re-examined

8.1 Copied Scriptural Extracts — Are they Doubtful/Apocryphal Texts?

What exactly is the nature of the *Heart Sūtra*? This is a very important question. As discussed above, Nattier pointed out that Indians and Chinese have very different criteria for determining the authenticity of a text. We shall examine the Chinese criteria in the first place. But I shall be brief as very good works have already been done by past researchers.

As China was not the birth place of Buddhism, all (foreign) sutras need to be transmitted through Sanskrit or through Central Asian languages. Therefore on top of the usual arguments over the legitimacy of Buddhist texts faced by the Indians, Chinese Buddhists — Vinaya masters and Buddhist bibliographers — would also need to closely guard against the creation of new scriptural works, done intentionally or otherwise, by the Chinese themselves. It is for this reason that the determination of the authenticity of translated sutras became very important right from the start.

Dao'an 释道安 (312–385) — father of Chinese Buddhist bibliography, was the very first to pay attention to the issue of scriptural authenticity. In his *An Catalogue*《安录》(no longer extant but its outline can be gleaned through quotations taken from it in the *You Catalogue*《祐录》) is an entry called "*Records of Doubtful Sutras*"《疑经录》. Certainly his concept of "doubtful" differs from the later day notion of "needing clarification". This concept of his is a negative one since everything listed in the entry are ideas opposed to Buddhist sutras. (Cao Ling 曹凌, 2009. p. 2) (Xiong Juan 熊娟, 2010, p. 19) The usage of such name as "doubtful" is prone to mislead. But in a way this reflected the state of play in the formative days of Buddhist bibliography.

By the time of Sengyou 僧祐 (445–518), the notion of "texts opposed to genuine sutras" was more scientifically defined as "doubtful/ fabricated texts" 疑经伪撰. It thus paved the way for sorting out such texts in later days, and laid the foundation for the basic classification used in the studies of non-authentic texts. In his *You Catalogue* 《祐录》(*Chu sanzang jiji*, T2145), Sengyou set out two criteria for determining if a text was authentic: whether from a doctrinal point of view the content was consistent with Buddha's teachings; and whether in terms of form it was a translation. In later days, these two criteria were also the most important ones for determining the authenticity of a scripture. (熊娟, 2010, p. 20)

Sengyou was also the first Buddhist bibliographer to have singled out "copied scriptural extracts" 抄经 as an independent concept. We note that he did not subscribe to the practice of copying for he wrote:

"Scripture copying is the act of collecting and citing that which is essential. In ancient times, Anshigao 安世高 copied from the text *Xiuxing*《修行》(*Xiuxing dao di jing, Yogācārabhūmi-sūtra* of Saṅgharakṣa, T 606) and turned it into the *Dadao dijing*《大道地经》(T607) because a fuller translation is indeed hard and so the text was abridged. Zhi qian 支谦 (222–252) also produced the scripture *Beichao*《孛抄》— an abridged version and not the dismembering of its Sanskrit original. But people of later days were inconsiderate. They wilfully copied or collated from the various works, or scattered bits of texts taken from them like tossing pieces of chess game around, or 'nail-dissected' the work proper. Not only did such acts make the noble teachings deviate from their truth, they also made the learners go after the trifling. Even Prince Wenxuan of Jingling 竟陵文宣王 (Xiao Zhaoye, 473-494), with his insight and profound understanding, could not avoid making such mistakes. If such acts are allowed to multiply with no end, there will be more of them over time. The dharma treasures will then be overgrown with weeds and will be sullied. How pitiful will the situation be? Once a work is done, making amends will be hard. All the copied scriptural extracts listed in Dao'an's catalogue have been included here. New works obtained by me are listed as entries shown on the left. I urge later generations not to imitate such actions of copying." (T2145, 37c)

Sengyou's tone was clearly harsh. In other words, he also listed this rather special textual form — copied scriptural extracts — in the like of fabricated texts. (Cao Ling 曹凌, 2009, p. 4) In this regard, he had more rigidly applied "translation" as a criterion of a genuine scripture. However, the reality faced by ancient Buddhist literature — as Sengyou himself would acutely be aware — was that some of the voluminous sutras were already facing circulation problems. Thus for generations, the act of copying parts of text from lengthy works, either for ease of circulation or for worshipping needs, had been an important religious practice. And even in translation, it was not always the case that the entire original work was translated; abridged versions were made instead. To some extent, this would affect the decision of whether to call a copied extract a fabrication. On the other hand, the rampant existence of scripture copying had also created a niche for non-authentic works. (Yin Guang Ming 殷光明, 2006, p. 15) One further point: Although copied extracts of sutras have made an important contribution to religious practice, they themselves are of no independent philological values. Therefore most Buddhist catalogues of all ages have adopted an attitude of "deletion" and "no need for making a canonical copy". (Wang Wen Yan 王文颜, 1997, p. 30) (Xiong Juan 熊娟, 2010, p. 27)

From this discussion we can see that copied scriptural extracts (also called 别生经 i.e. "other-generated sutras" and so on) have a delicate relationship with the concept of non-authentic sutras. This has therefore caused Buddhist bibliographers in the past to be prone to self-contradiction in how they regard such texts. For example Sengyou included in his *New Catalogue of Miscellaneous Doubtful/ Fabricated Sutras*《新集疑经伪撰杂录》the text "*Ablution Sūtra*"《灌顶经》. Leaving aside its authenticity, this text was notated with these words by Sengyou: "copied from a scripture" (T55, no.2145, 39a). In other words while he regarded it a copied text he placed it in his catalogue of non-authentic sutras nevertheless. A similar example can be found with the texts "*Most Essential Knowledge of the Six Meanings of the Dharma*"《佛法有六义第一应知》and "*Six Unimpeded, Unobstructed Entries to the Acts of Cleansing the Six Senses*"《六通无碍六根淨业义门》. Here Sengyou clearly pointed out that these were copied from Buddhist sutras. However, because they were combined into one text and "given a different name" by the copier, he placed them in his *Catalogue* as doubtful/fabricated texts, "for fear of confusion to posterity" [T: 右二部。齐武帝时。比丘释法愿抄集经义所出。虽弘经义异于伪造。然既立名号则/别成一部。惧后代疑乱。故明注于录。T2145, 39b]. By contrast, his contemporary Xiaoziliang 萧子良 [T: i.e. Prince Wenxuan of Jingling 竟陵文宣王 mentioned above], well-known for his scripture copying work, placed the same two texts in his *New Catalogue of Copied Scriptural Extracts*《新集抄经录》instead of treating them as non-authentic. With a twist, this same collection of Xiaoziliang was placed in the "non-authentic" category in later catalogues such as *Fajinglu*《法经录》, *Renshoulu*《仁寿录》, *Neidianlu*《內典录》, *Kaiyuanlu*《开元录》and *Zhenyuanlu*《貞元录》. It can thus be seen that in ancient China there was never a consensus of opinion when it came to how copied extracts of sutras should be categorized. (Wang Wen Yan 王文颜, 1997, p. 7, 32-33) And the reason for this is that ancient Chinese Buddhist bibliographies did not grasp one important difference between two concepts, namely, a copied scriptural extract narrates what has already been written and creates nothing new, while a doubtful/fabricated scripture does both. (Zhang Miao 张淼, 2006, p. 20)

Returning to the *Heart Sūtra*, we see that since ancient times it has been the case that some monks considered it a copied scriptural extract. For instance Kuiji 窥基 of Temple Cien 慈恩, a disciple of Xuanzang, gave the following explanation for the title of the *Xin jing* (*Heart Sūtra*):

> "'*xin*' ('heart') refers to that which is solid and most splendid. The *Dajing*《大经》tailors its teachings for various audiences and circumstances, and is thus broad in scope with meanings

> and content (such that) when one receives it, upholds it, transmits it and studies it, one may take fright and retreat. The noble preacher of dharma thus extracted from it purport that is substantial and most splendid and composed this *Xin jing*. (In the process) therefore, the three-section genre, the two front and back prefaces of the original text are all but lost." (T1710, 33.524a)

In other words Kuiji (632-683 CE) thought that because the *Da boruo jing*《大般若经》(i.e. the *Dajing*《大经》quoted above) is too broad and cumbersome, the "noble preacher of dharma" copied parts of it to produce the *Heart Sūtra* and thereby losing its introductory and concluding sections. Kuiji's remark is very important for understanding the early formation of the *Heart Sūtra* as well as its place in Buddhist literature. Kuiji considered it a copied scriptural extract, and in his days the copying was already done. Had the copying been done by Xuanzang, (his disciple) Kuiji would not have simply brushed it aside with the phrase "a noble preacher of dharma".

Another disciple of Xuanzang — Woncheuk 圆測 (613-696 CE) from the Korean empire of Silla (新罗, 57 BC — 935 AD), held the same view. He cited as an example the *Boruo xin jing*《般若心经》(*Heart Sūtra*) when he discussed the classification of Buddhist texts in his *Renwang jing shu*《仁王经疏》(*Commentary on the Karunikarājaprajñā-pāramitāsūtra*) as follows:

> "But the various sutras have different name invocations at the beginning of the text and these are of four types: 'self-generated sutras 自有经 [T: as opposed to 'other-generated sutras' 别生经] which begin by invoking the name of the Buddha only such as《涅槃》(*Nirvāṇa Sūtra*) and so on; 'self-generated sutras which begin by invoking the names of the Bhagavats only such as《大品》(**Mahāprajñāpāramitā*) and so on; 'self-generated sutra' which begin by invoking the names of both the Buddha and the Bhagavats such as《无上依》('*In Accordance with the Utmost*')

> [T: T669] and so on; and sutras invoking neither name such as *Taxin*《多心》(*Heart Sūtra*) and so on. This is the way the various sutras differ. Since *Ta xin jing*《多心经》and the like are recorded variously from the one same source for transmission, they therefore carry no name invocation." (T1708, 364a)

Again from the above remark, it can be seen that in the eye of Woncheuk *Boruo xin jing*《般若心经》(*Heart Sūtra*) is also a typical copied scriptural extract and is therefore distinct from most other texts.

Once the concept of "copied scriptural extract" is clear, Western researchers such as Tokuno also considered the *Heart Sūtra* a copied text (Tokuno, 1990). Nattier noted that in a letter dated 21 January 1992, Robert Buswell suggested to her that the *Heart Sūtra* might be "a kind of ch'ao-ching ('condensed *sūtra*')". (Nattier, 1992, p. 210, n. 48) From all these discussions, we can see that starting with Xuanzang's two disciples, the short-form *Heart Sūtra* has been considered a copied scripture extract, which is what it is indeed.

8.2 Records of the *Heart Sūtra* in Catalogues of Sutras

Below we will briefly discuss the various entries of the *Heart Sūtra* recorded in the various scriptural catalogues of ancient China. To this day the earliest record of the *Heart Sūtra* is found in fascicle five — "Records from Various Dynasties" 代录 , of the *Datang Neidian Catalogue*《大唐內典录》by Daoxuan 道宣 (596-667 CE), which has records from early Tang to the time the catalogue is completed (which coincides with Xuanzang's year of death, i.e. First Year of Linde 麟德) [T: 664 AD]. In this catalogue, listed under Xuanzang's series of translations are:

> "the *Bukong juansuo shenzhou xin jing*《不空羂索神咒心经》(*Amoghapāśa-hṛdaya-dhāraṇī*), the *Shiyimian shenzhou xin jing*《十一面神咒心经》("*Eleven-faced Deity Hṛdaya-dhāraṇī*"), the *Chengzan qifo minghao gongde jing*《称赞七佛名号功德经》("*Sūtra of the Merit of Praising the Seven Appellations of the*

> *Buddha*"), the *Boruo Ta xin jing*《般若多心经》(*Prajñāpāramitā-hṛdaya-sūtra*), the *Qianzhuan tuoluoni jing*《千啭陀罗尼经》("*Thousand Chirping Hṛdaya-dhāraṇī*") … as listed on the right totalling 1,344 fascicles from 67 works of Mahāyāna as well as Hīnayāna sutras and commentaries, translated on imperial decree by *śramaṇa* Shi Xuanzang 释玄奘 of the Grand Cien Temple 大慈恩寺 of the Imperial Capital." (T55, no. 2149, 282a-283a)

In addition, the *Heart Sūtra* was also listed by Daoxuan in fascicle eight — *Records of Canonical Entries* 入藏录, and in fascicle nine — *Records of Recited Highlights from Various Sutras in Successive Dynasties* 历代众经举要转读录. These records put in place the necessary conditions for the large scale transmission of the *Heart Sūtra*.

But strangely in fascicle six — *Records of Translated Mahāyāna Sūtras With or Without Single or Multiple Re-translations in Successive Dynasties* 历代大乘藏经翻本单重传译有无录, all sutras after the *Xukongzang pusa wen chijing jifu jing*《虚空藏菩萨问持经几福经》are listed as "sutras with unknown translators" 失译经, and we find among them, second from the last, an entry for *Boruo Ta xin jing*《般若多心经》.

We should note here that Daoxuan was a contemporary of Xuanzang. The active period of translation of the latter is between the twentieth year of Zhenguan 贞观 (646 CE) — the second year on his return (from India), and the first year of Linde 麟德 (664 CE) — the year of his passing (edited by Ji Xian Lin 季羡林 et. al., 1985, pp. 111-114) Daoxuan (596-667 CE) lived around the same time as Xuanzang. The time he completed his catalogue was also the time when Xuanzang concluded his translation period. Besides, Daoxuan participated in Xuanzang's translation activities and had played a considerable role in them. (Wang Shao Feng 王紹峰, 2004, pp. 7-8) So, we should have no reasons to question the accuracy of Daoxuan's records in his catalogue especially those on someone his contemporary. But then, how do we explain the discrepancy we see in his catalogue — is the *Boruo ta xin jing* the work of an unknown translator or that of Xuanzang?

My own conjecture on the matter is that perhaps the *Boruo ta xin jing* was a wilful addition to the “Records from Various Dynasties” 代录 by a late comer. This is because in some edition of Daoxuan’s catalogue, the finishing sentence that reads “listed on the right are 67 works of Mahāyāna and Hīnayāna texts” actually reads “65 works”. Therefore we can know from this that two unnamed texts have been added to the original version. Although we have no evidence to suggest that the added texts were the *Boruo ta xin jing*, its listing among those texts whose translators are unknown has necessarily led me to this conjecture.

Thereafter, Shijingtai 释静泰 composed his *Dongjing Jingai Temple Grand Catalogue of All Sutras*《東京大敬爱寺一切经目录》(*Jingai Catalogue* for short), whose completion date is variously claimed to be the third year of Longshuo 龙朔 (663 CE), (Wang Wen Yan 王文顔, 1997, p. 12) or the first year of Linde 麟德 (664 CE). (Cao Ling 曹凌, 2009, p. 10) But according to the catalogue’s preface, which reads:

> “By imperial decree dated the Twenty Second Day of the First Month of the Third Year of Longshuo 龙朔 [T: 663 CE], an order was issued for the compilation of the *Catalogue on All Sutras* 《一切经论目》at the Jingai Temple dharma place 敬爱道场. And by imperial decree dated the Twenty Sixth Day of the First Month of the First Year of Linde 麟德 [T: 664 CE], ten *śramaṇa* well-versed with Buddhist doctrines including Huigai 惠概, Mingyu 明玉, Shencha 神察, Daoying 道英, Tan Shu 昙邃 and others were gathered, and an outstanding person especially skilled in literary interpretations was selected. For three years, cross-referencing, repeated checking, text comparing, and editing were done. … 2,731 fascicles from 741 old scriptural and commentarial works were compiled, and 1,335 fascicles from 75 new translation works by Xuanzang were included. Altogether, 4,066 fascicles from 816 works new and old were written into the canon. The

> number of sutras from day one with a catalogue entry but no text amounts to 725 fascicles from 382 works; these are recorded here as investigations are being done. …… I, Jing Tai 静泰, not withstanding my own ignorance, wrote this preface. …… This *Catalogue* comprises five fascicles, as listed on the left"; (T2148, 180c)

It could only have been completed in the first year of Qianfeng 乾封 (666 CE), two years [T: emended from "three years"] after the completion of Daoxuan's *Neidian Catalogue* in the first year of Linde [T: 664 CE]. In this *Catalogue* the *Boruo xin jing*《般若心经》(*Heart Sūtra*) is clearly attributed to Xuanzang. Thereafter, this same ascription was adopted by all later catalogues and these are not separately discussed here.

If it was in the *Neidian*《內典录》that Xuanzang's *Heart Sūtra* made its (first) appearance, then it was not until the *Kaiyuan Catalogue*《开元录》(composed in 730 CE) [T: by Zhisheng 智升] that another important version of the *Heart Sūtra* — the Kumārajīva translation, made its first appearance. Fascicles four and eight of the *Kaiyuan Catalogue* separately stated that the Kumārajīva version and the Xuanzang version respectively included:

> "the one-fascicle *Mohe Boruo boluomi damingzhou jing*《摩诃般若波罗蜜大明咒经》; also known as *Mohe damingzhou jing*《摩诃大明咒经》; first translation; same source as the Tang translation *Boruo xin jing*《般若心经》(*Heart Sūtra*) and others"; (T55, no. 2154, 512b)
>
> "the one-fascicle *Boruo boluomi Ta xin jing*《般若波罗蜜多心经》; see the *Neidian Catalogue*《內典录》; second translation; same source as the *Mohe boruo damingzhou jing*《摩诃般若大明咒经》; translated on the Twenty Forth Day of the Fifth Month of the Twenty Third Year of Zhenguan 贞观 at the Cuiwei Palace 翠微宫 in Mount Zhongnan 终南山; written as dictated by *śramaṇa* Zhiren 知仁". (T55, no. 2154, 555c)

It is thus clear that the entry of the Xuanzang version in Zhisheng's *Kaiyuan Catalogue* was made based on Daoxuan's *Neidian Catalogue*. However, it is unclear what the basis was for the entry "Kumārajīva's version, first translation". But according to fascicle eleven, this version is "an omission made good" 拾遺編入 (T55, no. 2154, 584a). Had there been a source of conclusive evidence, Zhisheng 智升, given his editorial rigour, would have written it down. But since the origin was doubtful, the entry for the text could only be given the vague remark: "an omission made good". Nevertheless, since fascicle nineteen — "Records of Canonical Entries"《入藏录》 does include both Xuanzang's and Kumārajīva's versions, the latter is also able to gain popular circulation.

In fact apart from these two versions, Zhisheng also recorded another one that was lost — the one-fascicle *Boruo boluomiduona jing*《般若波罗蜜多那经》by the Tang translator Bodhiruci 菩提流支. His remark is: "newly catalogued; third translation; same source as the *Damingzhou jing*《大明咒经》listed on the right; all in three different translations: two in collection, one lost". (T55, no. 2154, 626b) This third translation was one (of the three) Zhisheng considered lost, and one that was in his own words "searched but not found". (T55, no. 2154, 570a) From the above discussion, we can see that in dealing with the different versions of the *Heart Sūtra*, Zhisheng, well known for his critical editing, has not been particularly rigorous in this instance.

Fascicle eleven (of the *Kaiyuan Catalogue*) also remarks that the Xuanzang and Kumārajīva versions are different translations of the *Heart Sūtra*, which has "three translations over time, two extant and one lost (author's note: the lost one being the *Boruo boluomiduona jing*《般若波罗蜜多那经》); previous catalogue has the *Heart Sūtra* listed as one single version; here it is catalogued as a collation of three texts including the re-translated *Renwang bore*《仁王般若》(*Benevolent King Prajñāpāramitā*); although the main teachings of these three texts are consistent with that found in the larger works (of Prajñāpāramitā), the three texts are not found in the latter nor derived from them; they are taken up by the minor schools" [T: no. 2154, 584a].

Briefly in summary: Zhisheng included Xuanzang's version in his *Kaiyuan Catalogue* on the basis of Daoxuan's *Neidian Catalogue* (where it first appeared); he then added the Kumārajīva version of dubious origin to his *Catalogue*; plus a third version which was by then lost — the *Boruo boluomiduona jing*《般若波罗蜜多那经》. In other words, his Kumārajīva version was something added to make good a lost text and not something sourced from another catalogue, its reliability is therefore questionable. In addition the Kumārajīva version appears later than the Xuanzang version [T: i.e. first appears in the *Kaiyuan Catalogue* which is later than the *Neidian Catalogue* in which the Xuanzang version first appears]. Therefore we can be completely certain that the Kumārajīva version is a late addition. However, due to the major influence of Zhisheng's *Kaiyuan Catalogue*, all later catalogues also included both versions in their *Records of Canonical Entries* 入藏录, and hence had enabled the Kumārajīva version to gain popular circulation.

Even so, we should also note that later authors like Huilin 慧琳 can still be very unsure about who the translator of the *Heart Sūtra* is, as exemplified in his *Yinyi*《音义》(*Meanings and Sounds of Words*) completed in 810 CE. (Fang Guang Chang 方广锠, 2006, p. 281) Huilin was born in 737 CE (the Twenty Fifth Year of Kaiyuan 开元 and died in 820 CE (the Fifteen Year of Yuanhe 元和). (Yao Yong Min 姚永銀, 2003, p.5) In the *Yinyi* three versions of the *Heart Sūtra* are mentioned:

> "one-fascicle *Daming zhoujing*《大明咒经》; previously *Boruo xin*《般若心》;
>
> one-fascicle *Boruo xin jing*《般若心经》; Kumārajīva; and
>
> one-fascicle *Boruo xin jing*《般若心经》; new translation from Jibin (罽宾, Kashmir)".
>
> (T54, no. 218, 362c)

Leaving aside the third version, which is a new translation, we notice that the first translation, i.e. what we normally call the Kumārajīva edition, is without the translator's name; while the second translation, i.e. what we normally call the Xuanzang edition, has the word: "Kumārajīva" (but CEBTA also notes that one other version is without the word: "Kumārajīva"). Whatever the case, it shows that for a very long time the issue of translator identity is never quite settled.

In subsequent passages dedicated to the discussion of the meanings and sounds of words, we read, following the clause "*Daming zhoujing*《大明咒经》, previously translated as *Boruo xin jing*《般若心经》" the three terms: 挂碍 "*gua ai*", ("hindrance"), 竭帝 "*gate*" ("gone"), and 僧婆诃 "*svāhā*" ("hail"); and following the clause "*Bore boluota xin jing*《般若波罗多心经》translated by Kumārajīva" we read: 五蕴 "*wu yun*" ("the five *skandhas*"), 揭帝 ("*gate*"), and 般啰 "*bo luo*" ("*prajñā*"). Note that in some versions the clause "translated by Kumārajīva" is absent, meaning these are texts without a known translator in their titles. Judging by the terms employed we know that: the first text — *Daming zhoujing*, is the Kumārajīva version in which the third term 僧婆诃 differs from 萨婆诃 used in his current version; the second text is clearly not the current Kumārajīva version because where it reads 五蕴 the current version reads 五阴, so it must be referring to the Xuanzang version — however in many cases the *Linyi*《琳音》[T: i.e. Huilin's 慧琳 Yinyi《音义》] erroneously attributed the authorship to Kumārajīva. This shows that at Huilin's time, the authorship of the two versions is still very confusing. By the time of the *Zhenyuan Catalogue*《貞元录》[T: composed in 800 AD] and later, the authorship of the two translations became more settled, although the concept of "same source" 同本 may still differ [T: i.e. "same source but different translations" 同本异译]. For example, the *Zhenyuan Catalogue* regarded the Kumārajīva version and the Xuanzang version as having the same source, and the Dharmacandra 法月 version and the Bo-re 般若 edition as having the same source (T55, no. 2157, 912a-b). However, these are minor details that we need not go into here.

Briefly in summary: Xuanzang's translation first appears in Daoxuan's *Neidian Catalogue*《内典录》but its entries in the various catalogue are inconsistent — some are recorded as "translated by Xuanzang", others as "translator unknown", and so the situation is rather dubious; Kumārajīva's translation first appears in (Zhisheng's) *Kaiyuan Catalogue* but its original is doubtful; also listed in this catalogue is another version now no longer extant. (Regarding Xuanzang's translation,) if we link the above discussion with what is said in §8.1, namely, that Xuanzang's disciples Kuiji 窥基 and Yuance 圆测 did not mention anything about their master having translated the *Boruo xin jing*《般若心经》(*Heart Sūtra*) but treated this text as a copied scriptural extract instead, we will be left wondering if "Xuanzang's translation" is indeed a translation by Xuanzang at all.

8.3 "Apocryphal", "Doubtful/Fabricated", Indigenous Texts – Clarification of Concepts

In ancient China locally composed, non-translated sutras were frequently consigned to the concepts of "doubtful texts", "fabricated texts" and so on. There have been many studies on this and is not here repeated. (Cao Ling 曹凌, 2009, pp. 2-4) (Xiong Juan 熊娟, 2010, pp. 19-28)

Before we argue over the "authenticity" of the *Heart Sūtra*, I feel it necessary to provide some analyses on the connotation 内涵 and denotation 外延, as well as the value judgement of the terms "apocryphal text", "doubtful text", and "fabricated text" as they are applied within and outside China for determining the authority of certain religious texts. Otherwise such determination may sink into the confusion of misguided attention caused by differences in conceptual delineation.

In the studies of scriptural authenticity, a common technical term used by Western academics is "apocryphal" often translated as "*yi wei*" 疑伪 — "doubtful/fabricated". But we must bear in mind that the studies of Buddhism in the West took place later than the studies of Christianity and to a large extent have been affected by the latter.

Therefore terminologies employed in Buddhist studies have been borrowed from Christian studies or other Western religions, and this fact equally applies to the term "apocryphal".

In terms of etymology, this term is derived from the Greek word "apokryphos" (ἀπόκρυφα) meaning "hidden". In Christian philological context, it means "non-canonical" or more precisely, "(sutras) not accepted into the Bible"; it does not contain a value judgement element found in the Chinese term "doubtful/fabricated" ("*yi wei*", 疑伪). (Robert Buswell, 1990, pp. 3-4) Therefore Christian researchers usually give the Chinese term a relatively neutral translation of "secondary scripture" 次经. Of course later on — more precisely after the 16th century — the term gradually assumed a value judgement nuance, even a tinge of heresy. (Robert Buswell, 1990, pp. 4) Therefore applying the term "apocryphal" to indigenous Buddhist sutras could cause certain problems. This is because unlike Christian literature such as the Bible, which is a relatively closed system, the Buddhist canon is relatively open. Therefore, up to a very late date, Buddhist literature did not have a fixed and immutable standard used for the exclusion of specific texts. Moreover, some home-grown Buddhist sutras (in China) also came to possess a status of authority no less commanding than orthodox Buddhist literature. As an example for this, I can cite the *Platform Sūtra of the Sixth Patriarch* by Huineng (慧能, 638–713). Therefore not all "apocryphal" texts are tainted with heretic hues.

For this reason the English academic world tend to use other terms to refer to texts that are excluded from orthodox canonical works and not well-regarded by Buddhist worshippers but are of philological value nonetheless. These important terms, which can replace the value-judging terminologies that are applied to (non-commentarial) Buddhist literature include: 1. "non-canonical"; 2. "post-canonical"; 3. "para-canonical"; 4. "extra-canonical"; 5. "indigenous" or "original" if geographical region is taken into account to denote non-translated texts locally produced by the Chinese themselves. Therefore, I would suggest that in the studies of scriptural authenticity — such as the authenticity of the non-translated, indigenous texts that were once branded "apocryphal" by us, the academic world could probably consider the use of the above terms, which are neutral, purely academic, without religious value-judgement, and without personal subjective emotional tones. This I feel can go a long way in avoiding the interference to academic research caused by religious emotions. Indeed simply linking an important scripture such as the *Heart Sūtra* to the word "fabrication" is enough to offend Buddhist worshippers and researchers alike. And "fake", relative to "true", is indeed an overly emotive term. In my own works therefore, I have always aimed to remove such unnecessary, man-made interferences, be they positive or negative.

8.4 "Heart" ("*hṛdaya*", "*xin*") in the *Heart Sūtra* ("*Xin jing*")

Since it is uncommon for Sanskrit manuscripts to have their titles appearing upfront, the Sanskrit titles of the various *Heart Sūtra* are written at the end of the texts with the words: *iti xxx samāptam* meaning: "there ends the scripture entitled xxx". On examination the following different titles can be found: *Ārya-prajñāpāramitā-hṛdaya*《圣般若波罗蜜多心》; *Prajñāpāramitā-hṛdaya-dhāraṇī*《般若波罗蜜多心陀罗尼》; *Pañcaviṃśatikā-nāma-dhāraṇī*《二十五颂名陀罗尼》; *Pañcaviṃśatikā Prajñāpāramitā-hṛdaya-nāma-dhāraṇī*《二十五颂般若波羅蜜多心名陀罗尼》; *Pañcaviṃśati-prajñāpāramitā*《二十五颂般若波罗多》; *Pañcaviṃśatikā Bhagavatī Prajñāpāramitā-hṛdaya*《二十五颂薄伽梵般若波罗蜜心》. Clearly the word "*sūtra*" never appears in the above titles. Rather, what commonly appears is *hṛdaya* ("heart"), or *dhāraṇī*, or both. To some extent, this also verifies Fukui Fumimasa's view that "heart" and "*dhāraṇī*" in the titles belong to the same concept. The etymology of "*dhāraṇī*" shows that it is a linguistic technique invented for the expedience of memorizing and retaining something. (Akira Hirakawa 平川彰, 2004, pp. 458-461) However, by the time of Tang when Vajrayāna became prevalent, *dhāraṇī* had assumed divine protective and salvific power and gradually became one in meaning with mantras and *vidyā*. I will return to this point later.

In whatever title of the above examples, the term *prajñāpāramitā-hṛdaya* can indeed be seen. This is a genitive *tatpuruṣa* compound [T: corrected from "*karmadhāraya* compound"], where the first word qualifies the last, i.e. "heart of *prajñāpāramitā*". The problem is: the word "heart" is often misunderstood, especially by Chinese speakers with no Sanskrit trainings. This is because the original word for "heart", as it appears in the various Sanskrit texts, is "*hṛdaya*" and not "*citta*" as commonly thought. Confusion arises because in ancient Chinese, both Sanskrit terms are translated as "*xin*" 心. Even in the *Heart Sūtra* (*Xin jing*), one finds in the saying 心无罣碍 ("*xin wu gua ai*" or "mind with no hindrance") another "*xin*" ("mind") which has a different meaning to the "*xin*" ("heart") in the title.

The word "*hṛdaya*" in the title "*prajñāpāramitā-hṛdaya*" refers to the human organ, the heart; or the chest, stomach and other visceral parts. This Sanskrit word is etymologically related to modern Indo-European languages. For instance it is related to the English word "heart". Although in a few cases, "*hṛdaya*" may refer to the seat of thought, it is by and large a reference to the organ heart of man and beast. (Monier-Williams SED: 1302) Thus, learned Chinese monks of old would render "*hṛdaya*" ("*xin*") into "meat-lump heart" 肉团心, "solid heart" 坚实心, "five-organ heart" 五藏心 and so on, in order to distinguish it from the more abstract "*citta*" (also "*xin*") for "mind". (Wu Jun Ru 吴汝钧, 1992, p. 104) The word "*hṛdaya*" has also been variously transliterated into Chinese as 紇利陀耶/紇哩陀耶 [T: both pronounced "*he li tuo ye*"], or 汗栗驮 [T: pronounced "*han li tuo*"] and so forth.

However, "*hṛdaya*" also has the extended meanings of "true or divine knowledge", or "core or essence or best or dearest or most secret part of anything". (Monier-Williams, 1889, p. 1302) We can see that in the titles of the *Heart Sūtra*, this would be its most fitting meaning.

The "*xin*" in "*xin wu gua ai*" 心无罣碍, for "*citta*", has a very different meaning. It refers to the most basic entity of our series of consciousness; a term we normally associate with the functions of thinking and deliberating. It has the meanings: "thinking, reflecting, imagining, thought, intention, aim, wish, memory", and etc. (Monier-Williams SED: 395). It is clearly different to "*hṛdaya*" the organ heart. Thus with their denotation and connotation clearly demarcated, the two Chinese concepts of "*xin*", respectively for "*hṛdaya*" and "*citta*", are easily distinguishable for Indian Buddhists. While on this point, we can also refer to a line taken from the Pāli commentary *Dhammasaṅgaṇi-aṭṭhakathā: cintanaṭṭhena cittā, vicittaṭṭhena vā cittā*. [T: corrected from "*cintanaṭṭhena cittā, vi cintanaṭṭhena vā cittā*"], meaning: "*cittā* is (understood) through the meaning of thoughts, or through the meaning of deliberation". (DhsA.CS:p. 92) [T: corrected from "Dhs.Acs:p. 92"]. Here *cittā* belongs to the same series of concepts as *mana* and *viññāṇa* in Pāli. (Bhikkhu Ming Fa 明法比丘, 2007, pages 'ch.1-6'). Thus in ancient China, "*citta*" was translated as "the thinking, deliberating heart" 念虑心, as opposed to "meat-lump heart" 肉团心 — a translation for "*hṛdaya*". In other words, the "heart" in the *Heart Sūtra* (i.e. the "*hṛdaya*" in "*Prajñāpāramitā-hṛdaya-sūtra*") does not refer to the "thinking, deliberating *xin*" which is "*citta*", the mind — at least this is not the original etymological meaning of "*hṛdaya*".

8.5 Xuanzang and Atikūṭa

Although I do not think Xuanzang translated the *Heart Sūtra* from Chinese into Sanskrit, I nevertheless think he was closely associated with the scripture and his association well surpassed that of any of his contemporaries. Precisely for this reason Nattier focused on Xuanzang in her studies and considered him to be the back-translator of the Sanskrit *Heart Sūtra*.

A close examination of Xuanzang's relationship with the *Heart Sūtra* broadly reveals the following: 1. the *Biography of Xuanzang* 《慈恩传》clearly shows that in his journey to the West, Xuanzang clearly benefited from the *Boruo xin jing*《般若心经》(*Heart Sūtra*), used for warding off evil spirits (note not the [T: Tang title] *Ta xin jing*《多心经》); 2. Xuanzang obtained the *Boruo xin jing* during his time in Sichuan (T2053, 224b); 3. In his old days, Xuanzang presented to the then emperor and empress “one fascicle of the *Boruo xin jing* written in gold with an attached letter”. According to both the *Biography of Xuanzang* and the *Xingzhuang* 《行状》[T: *A Brief Bibliographical Sketch of the Late Venerable Xuanzang of Great Tang*《大唐故三藏玄奘法师行状》by Ming Xiang 冥祥 of Tang]: He left Chang An 长安 at the age of 19 in 618 CE, Frist Year of Wude 武德, to escape war in the closing days of the Sui Dynasty; entered Sichuan via the Ziwu Valley 子午谷; (Yang Ting Fu 杨廷福, 1998, pp. 67-68) stayed there until the Fifth Year of Wude (622 CE) ; left after observing the summer *varṣa* [T: lit. rainy retreat]; went eastward by following the river down-stream until he reached Jingzhou 荆州. (Yang Ting Fu 杨廷福, 1998, pp. 75-76)

We thus know the first contact Xuanzang had with the *Boruo xin jing* (*Heart Sūtra*) must have occurred during these four years. He began his westward journey in 629 CE, the Third Year of Zhenguan 贞观. Thereupon he frequently recited the scripture for warding off evil spirits during his sojourn. Precisely because of this experience, Xuanzang was very fond of the text right to his last days, which culminated in him presenting a version of the *Boruo xin jing* written in gold to the imperial court. Perhaps it is due to such attachment that his translation of the 600-fascicle *Da boruo jing*《大般若经》almost became the finishing work of his entire translation career. This translation began on the first day of the first month of 660 CE, the Fifth Year of Xianqing 显庆, and lasted until 663 CE, the Third Year of Longshuo 龙朔, spanning three years and eleven months. Xuanzang passed away in spring the following year (664 CE), the First Year of Linde 麟德. (Yang Ting Fu 杨廷福, 1998, pp. 278-288) We can thus say that the *Boruo xin jing* (*Heart Sūtra*) meant a lot to Xuanzang in his whole life. If his biographies were to be believed, we can broadly come up with the following sketch: In his youth Xuanzang obtained a Chinese version of the *Heart Sūtra* in Sichuan, which broadly speaking was copied from Kumārajīva’s *Large Sūtra*, plus a mantra. This text with a *dhāraṇī* helped him conquered many obstacles in his westward journey. Therefore, till the very end, it was one of his favourite texts. As he himself was well-versed with *prajñāpāramitā* texts, he probably had consciously done some re-writing and editing to the text in his possession. But his contemporary Daoxuan 道宣, as well as his own disciples knew full-well that the *Heart Sūtra* was not a translated text, so it was never recorded as one of his translated works.

Furthermore, we also need to pay attention to a contemporary of Xuanzang — Atikūṭa 阿地瞿多 [T: lit. "beyond the summit" 无极高], who arrived at Changan on the very day Xuanzang returned from India. Atikūṭa translated the *Dhāraṇīsamuccaya* into Chinese《陀罗尼集经》(*Catalogue of Dhāraṇī*) (T901), which might have exerted a major influence on Xuanzang's *Boruo xin jing* (*Heart Sūtra*). Nattier also mentions in her article that the mantra found in the *Heart Sūtra* has probably come from this Atikūṭa work. This point is also made when we talk about the article by Shen Jiu Cheng 沈九成 in §7. Although in Sanskrit the mantra in Xuanzang's *Da boruo jing* (T220) and the mantra in his *Heart Sūtra* (T251) are the same, in Chinese transliteration they are different. However the *Heart Sūtra* mantra has identical Chinese transliteration with the *Dhāraṇīsamuccaya* mantra (more details below).

Therefore we must first pay attention to the special relationship between Atikūṭa and Xuanzang. Xuanzang himself is also very fond of *dhāraṇī* texts. That is why upon his return to Changan, one of the very first four sutras he translated is a *dhāraṇī* text (T2053, 254a). Atikūṭa's *Dhāraṇīsamuccaya* includes a *dhāraṇī* with a title that may arouse suspicion [sic]: *Boruo boluomita daxin jing*《般若波罗蜜多大心经》(T901, 804c-805a), as well as a *dhāraṇī Boruo daxin tuoluoni* No.16《般若大心陀羅尼第十六》(T901, 807b20) that is identical with the *Heart Sūtra* mantra:

(T901, 807b20)

跢 (ta) 姪 (dya) 他 (thā) 揭 (ga) 帝 (te) 揭 (ga) 帝 (te) 波 (pa) 罗 (ra) 揭 (ga) 帝 (te)

波 (pa) 啰 (ra) 僧 (saṃ) 揭 (ga) 帝 (te) 菩 (bo) 提 (dhi) 莎 (svā) 诃 (hā)

(T251, 848c22)

揭 (ga) 帝 (te) 揭 (ga) 帝 (te) 波 (pa) 罗 (ra) 揭 (ga) 帝 (te)

波 (pa) 罗 (ra) 僧 (saṃ) 揭 (ga) 帝 (te) 菩 (bo) 提 (dhi) 萨婆 (svā) 訶(hā)

Also noteworthy is the fact that Xuanzang, (apparently) inspired by Atikūṭa, and having finished his translations of the *Abhidharmakośa*《俱舍论》and the *Nyāyānusāriṇī*《順正理论》, started his translation of numerous *dhāraṇī* texts on the tenth day of the ninth month in the very year Atikūṭa finished his translation of the *Dhāraṇīsamuccaya*, i.e. 654 CE or the Fifth Year of Yonghui 永徽. According to the *Kaiyuan Catalogue*《开元录》, these *dhāraṇī* texts are: one fascicle of the *Salvation of the Suffering Dhāraṇī*《拔济苦难陀罗尼经》translated on the tenth day of the ninth month of the Fifth Year of Yonghui 永徽; one fascicle of the *Eight-Name Invocation for Deliverance Dhāraṇī* translated on the twenty seventh day; one fascicle of the *Victory Banner Arm Bracelet Dhāraṇī*《胜幢臂印陀罗尼经》(**Dhvajāgra-keyūra*) translated on the twenty ninth day; and one fascicle of the *Upholding the World Dhāraṇī*《持世陀罗尼经》translated on the tenth day of the tenth month. (Yang Ting Fu 杨廷福, 1988, pp. 258-259) Therefore, although we can find no evidence in extant historical records that Atikūṭa did have an influence on Xuanzang, we still have grounds to infer that the two were connected in some way, for the fact that both were translating in Changan at the same time; were probably having an impact on each other's interest in spiritual pursuit; and the fact that Atikūṭa's work provided the source of the mantra in Xuanzang's *Heart Sūtra*.

We cannot completely rule out the above situation as the background to the production of the so-called Xuanzang *Heart Sūtra*. At the very least, we can be very sure that at the time of Xuanzang's return to China, the *Boruo xin jing* (*Heart Sūtra*) was enjoying a favourable backdrop that was conducive to its popular acceptance.

8.6 Avalokiteśvara and Śāriputra in the *Heart Sūtra* — Why the Role Reversal?

8.6.1 Prajñāpāramitā and Female Deities in Buddhism

One of the noteworthy features of the *Heart Sūtra* is what Nattier called "role reversal", namely, in Prajñāpāramitā texts, the main narrators are normally the Buddha and Subhūti, but in the *Heart Sūtra* the main narrator has been strikingly changed to Avalokiteśvara 观世音. Nattier's article does not offer an explanation for this role reversal, and what features in terms of time and background it reflects.

The birth place of Prajñāpāramitā sutras is related to that of Mahāyāna Buddhism. Although this issue is rather complex, current mainstream views include the South India Origin theory and the North India Origin theory. More specifically, the former has the origin located in Southern India, in the Andhra country, on the Kistnā River. Near Amarāvati and Dhānyakaṭaka in this region, the Mahāsāṅghikas 大众部 had two famous monasteries which respectively belong to the Pūrvaśaila School 东山住派 and the Aparaśaila School 西山住派. These schools are significant because: 1) they had a Prajñāpāramitā text in Prakrit; 2) they spoke of the *dharmadhātu* in the same way as Prajñāpāramitā literature did (see also A.K. Warder 渥德尔, 1987, p. 339); and 3) their Buddhology prepared the way for that of the Prajñāpāramitā thought (Conze, 2000a, p. 1). Warder also considered certain special sutras such as the *Rāṣṭrapālaparipṛcchā*《护国尊者所问经》to be written by the Pūrvaśaila. (渥德尔, 1987, p. 331)

It was clearly recorded among Prajñāpāramitā literature such as the commonly regarded earliest text *Aṣṭasāhasrikā-prajñāpāramitā-sūtra*《八千颂般若经》that Prajñāpāramitā texts originated in Southern India. The Chinese *Xiaopin jing*《小品经》[T: i.e. *Aṣṭasāhasrikā-prajñāpāramitā-sūtra*] stated: "the distribution of Prajñāpāramitā texts should (first) be in the South; from there to the West; and from the West to the North." (T227, 555a) For more discussion on this please refer to my related studies (Ji Yun 紀贇, 2011, pp. 58-59). Conze demonstrated that the Aprachana [T: *dvācatvāriṃśad-*

akṣaramukha 四十二字门 lit. "42 mouthful-(Siddham)-syllables"], used as a spiritual practice that had greatly influenced late-stage Buddhism (Akira Hirakawa 平川彰, 2004, pp. 462-464), has in the *Da zhidu lun*《大智度论》**Mahāprajñāpāra-mitopadeśa* (a commentary on Prajñāpāramitā sutras) the presence of linguistic remnants of Southern Indian dialects. (Conze, 2000a, p. 3, n. 3) All these serve to show that early Prajñāpāramitā literature probably originated in Southern India.

On the other hand, E. Lamotte's theory of Northwest India origin (E. Lamotte, 1954) and A. Bareau's theory of Northern Dekkhan Plateau origin (Bareau, 1955, pp. 296-305) could perhaps be reconciled to illustrate that Prajñāpāramitā texts did originate in South India but survived or even prospered in the Northwest. (Conze, 2000a, pp. 2-4)

We shall now return to our topic. Nāgārjuna lived in the vicinity of Dhānyakaṭaka. In nearby Jaggayyapaṭa the following inscription on a stupa has been found: "Bhadanta Nāgārjunācārya" (J. Burgess, 1882, p. 57). This region was extensively influenced by both Dravidian and Greek cultures. So, Conze made some comparisons between Prajñāpāramitā thought and Sophia ideas of the Mediterranean, and found many commonalities between the two. (Conze, 2000b, pp. 207-209) In this article (actually a book review) Conze pointed out that at around 200 BC wisdom worship began to take shape coincidentally in the Mediterranean and in India despite their great geographical divide; in each case wisdom worship was apparently independent from its own cultural antecedents. There are some obvious parallels between the two cultures. For instance, both Sophia and Prajñāpāramitā are feminine words;[31] Sophia is a "mother" (Ringgren, 1947, pp. III, 124-125), while Prajñāpāramitā is the "mother of the Buddhas and the Bodhisattvas"; Sophia is equivalent to the Hebrew "*tōrō*" (law) (Ringgren, 1947, p. 110, 114), while Prajñāpāramitā is the Buddhist *dharma* and so on. Altogether Conze made scores of other comparisons. (Conze, 2000b, pp. 207-208)

---

[31] This refers to the gender of a word, just as *prajñā* is also a feminine word. Such grammatical gender is hard to understand for users of Chinese – a language which basically has no gender distinction (except for pronouns).

It is worth pointing out that Conze astutely noted the female gender of the word *prajñāpāramitā*. Although this may not be the ultimate reason for Prajñāpāramitā texts — starting with the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā* — to refer to Prajñāpāramitā as "mother of all the Buddhas", we cannot but to associate the two. Corresponding to this is the fact that Buddhist visual arts also present statues of the personified Prajñāpāramitā deity in female forms. For example, fascicle three of the previously mentioned *Dhāraṇīsamuccaya*《陀罗尼集经》, which is important to the discussion of the *Heart Sūtra*, presents "Ways of Painting the Great Prajñāpāramitā" 画大般若像法 as follows:

Painting the great Prajñāpāramitā Bodhisattva: One can choose (to paint on) the fifteenth day of the month, using two rolls of superior fine silk … For the body of the Bodhisattva — apart from the crown — paint it one *visati* long [T: Monier-Williams SED: "said to be about 9-inches", 一肘/一磔]; paint it white throughout; paint three eyes in the face; give it the appearance of a heavenly maiden, with the proper looks and manners befitting a Bodhisattva. (T 901, 805a)

From these descriptions we can see that at least in the days when Atikūṭa made the above translation (ca. 653-654 CE), a personified Prajñāpāramitā deity had already acquired the appearance of a goddess.

We should also note that among the various *Heart Sūtra* translations, the version by Dānapāla 施护 of Song has the title *Noble-Buddha-Mother Prajñāpāramitā-sūtra According to the Buddha*《佛说圣佛母般若波罗蜜多经》. Here the title has directly been given a feminine flavour. In other words, in the ideological system of Mahāyāna Buddhism, Prajñāpāramitā and Fomu 佛母 or "Buddha-Mother" are one and same concepts, with the latter the personification and embodiment of the former.

According to Conze, who based his view on records in the *Biography of Faxian*《法显传》, the timing of the personification of Prajñāpāramitā can be traced back to 400 CE. (Conze, 2000a, p. 14) Examination shows that the *Biography* indeed recorded that: "the Mahāyānists make their offerings to the Prajñāpāramitā, the Mañjuśrī, the Avalokiteśvara, and so on" (T2085, 859b). Here Prajñāpāramitā is juxtaposed with Mañjuśrī and Avalokiteśvara, and she has been worshipped as a personified deity ever since. However, later records on her worship are scanty, showing that this practice did not gain much popularity until about Tang when such worships became prevalent once again. This happens almost in synchrony with the "tantricization" of Prajñāpāramitā texts.

8.6.2 Prajñāpāramitā, Avalokiteśvara and Dhāraṇī — their Unique Relationships

We should also note that in tantric-influenced Prajñāpāramitā literature studded with copious *dhāraṇī*, the Prajñāpāramitā and the Avalokiteśvara are delicately associated with one another. The *Dhāraṇīsamuccaya*《陀罗尼集经》states the following:

"I, so-and-so, make offerings to all the Buddhas, the Prajñāpāramitās, the Avalokiteśvara Bodhisattva, the bodhisattvas, the Vajragarbha Bodhisattva, the *Deva-nāga* and *Aṣṭau-nikāyāḥ* 天龙八部, the guardians of *stupa* and *dharma* and so forth, in the Ten Directions." (T901, 787b);

And the following:

"Next, incense should be lit; perform the Buddha *mudrā* if you wish to invoke the Buddhas; next, perform the Prajñāpāramitā *mudrā* to invoke the Prajñāpāramitā; next, perform the Avalokiteśvara Bodhisattva *mudrā* to invoke the Avalokiteśvara Bodhisattva; next, invoke the Vajragarbhas and the Devas in a similar way." (T901, 811a)

It is obvious from the above discussion that the personified Prajñāpāramitā and Avalokiteśvara are closely associated with one another. One other point to note is that in *dhāraṇī* sutras of tantric Buddhism the role of the Avalokiteśvara is equally prominent. We continue to use Atikūṭa's *Dhāraṇīsamuccaya* as an example. This work has twelve fascicles. The first and second are about the Buddhas; the third is unspecific but judging by its content it should be about Prajñāpāramitā; two-thirds of fascicles 3-6 concern the Avalokiteśvara, the remaining third concerns the Bhodhisattvas: Mahāsthāmaprāpta 大势至, Mañjuśrī 文殊, Maitreya 弥勒, Kṣitigarbha 地藏, Samantabhadra 普贤, and Ākāśagarbha 虚空藏; fascicles 7-9 are about the *Vajracchedikā*; fascicles 10-12 are about the various devas; and fascicle 12 included the concluding *Duhui Dharmamaṇḍa Mudrā*《都会道场印品》and other articles. From the way these fascicles are divided up, it can be seen that among the Mahāyāna Bodhisattvas, Avalokiteśvara's status in *dhāraṇī*-type sutras surpasses that of the other Bodhisattvas — or shall we say the status of Subhūti — the main narrator of early Prajñāpāramitā literature, is not one that is on a par with Avalokiteśvara's.

In other words, at least starting from Tang (or thereabout), the (personified) Avalokiteśvara held a very unique place in Prajñāpāramitā sutras, especially in those texts that have been "tantricized"; and also had a very close association with the (personified) Prajñāpāramitā. Therefore, we may say that the appearance of Avalokiteśvara in the *Boruo xin jing*《般若心经》(*Heart Sūtra*) in Tang is hardly accidental. We may even conclude, from the fact that Avalokiteśvara takes centre stage in the *Boruo xin jing*, that the text was composed in the days of Xuanzang and no earlier.

We mention above the feminisation tendency of the Prajñāpāramitā, at least during Tang when the *Heart Sūtra* was produced. In this regard, we should also note the feminisation tendency of the Avalokiteśvara, which took place almost concurrently.

The name "Avalokiteśvara" 观自在 ("*guan zi zai*") has become a common acceptance ever since Xuanzang considered the original name "Avalokitasvara" 观世音 ("*guan shi yin*") a misnomer. But following the discovery by N.D. Mironov in August 1923 of five occurrences of "Avalokitasvara" in the (Sanskrit) *Saddharma-puṇḍárīka-sūtra* 法华经 among the Otani University Collection, the resolution of this issue on philological grounds became possible. (Mironov, 1927) (Mironov, 1961) (Yu Jun Fang 于君方, 2009, p. 63) The Otani Sanskrit fragments were later edited by Jiang Zhong Xin 蒋忠新, who dedicated a preface in his article to explaining the epithets of Avalokitasvara and thus provided "philological evidence for showing the reliability of Kumārajīva's translated name of 观世音 (Avalokitasvara)". (Jiang Zhong Xin 蒋忠新, 1997, pp. 10-11) Recently the well-known philologist Professor Seishi Karashima 辛岛靜志, newly appointed Head of the International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University, reports that apart from the Otani Collection, other Sanskrit fragments have also been found to carry the name "Avalokitasvara", a name influenced by the Gāndhārī language. (Seishi Karashima 辛岛靜志, 2009, p. 204)

Be it "Avalokiteśvara" or "Avalokitasvara", the gender of these Indian words is masculine. Although in religion a *bodhisattva* may be gender neutral, in etymology it is not. And there is thus no surprise that in early Buddhist literature, the Avalokitasvara is regarded as a male figure, as evidence by the common address of him as "son of a noble family" 善男子 or "*kulaputra*"); or the depiction of him as a *śramaṇa* or a Taoist monk in popular literature such as the *Prophecy Fulfilment of Avalokitasvara*《观世音应验记》. By Tang however, for particular social and religious reasons, Avalokitasvara gradually accomplished its feminisation in Chinese society. (Shi Hou Zhong 释厚重, 2005, pp. 60-72) Of course, there may be many explanations for the male to female gender change of Avalokitasvara. For example, Professor Yü Chün-fang 于君方 suggested it was "a reaction to the patriarchy of monastic Buddhism and Neo-Confucian Rationalism". (Yü Chün-fang于君方, 2009, p. 41) But I wish to remind the readers here that we must never underestimate the impact of the feminized, personified Prajñāpāramitā on the gender change of the Avalokitasvara.

Although this is a topic for further discussion in the future, one thing is (now) certain: The feminization of the Avalokitasvara happened in sync with the "trantricization" of Chinese Buddhism and the "*dhāraṇī*-zation" of Prajñāpāramitā sutras. Some scholars have in fact astutely observed that by the stage of "trantricization", "the *nirmāṇakāya* 化身 ("transformed body") of Guanyin 观音 in China is predominantly feminine", and "although different Vajrayāna sutras focus on the different *nirmāṇakāya* of Avalokiteśvara, they have something in common: first and foremost is their natural emphasis on the recitation of *dhāraṇī*." (Yü Chün-fang 于君方, 2009, pp. 67, 72) Therefore, when all these key elements are put together, we can more or less arrive at the historical background of the *Heart Sūtra* be it the Kumārajīva version or the Xuanzang version, namely, as an independent text, this scripture could never have been produced any time earlier than Tang.

8.6.3 The Role of Śāriputra

If the Bodhisattva Avalokiteśvara signifies the emergence of a new Buddhist tradition, then the contrary figure will be Śāriputra — the other character in the *Heart Sūtra* worthy of our attention, and one who could in a way be regarded as a 'villain' in Prajñāpāramitā texts.

Conze painted the following picture of how Prajñāpāramitā literature was formulated. First there was the *mātṛkā* 本母 — numerical summaries of the Abhidharma. Towards the end of Aśoka's reign, the *mātṛkā* were differentiated into two kinds of relatively independent works: the traditional Abhidharma and the Prajñāpāramitā. Śāriputra is the representative of the former works (Migot, 1954, pp. 511-541). In early Prajñāpāramitā literature especially the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā* there were two major tendencies, namely, the item-by-item refutation of the Abhidharma, and the affirmation of Mahāyāna Buddhism. In order to establish its own uniqueness, Mahāyāna Buddhism needed a "tangible target" and this role fell upon Hīnayāna Buddhism, represented in the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā* by the *śrāvakas* and the *pratyekabuddhas*. The personified representative of these Hīnayānists is Śāriputra, who is the most important adherent to original Buddhism, and a great disciple of the Buddha. (Conze, 2000a, pp. 4-5) In early Mahāyāna works especially Prajñāpāramitā literature, Śāriputra came to represent those having a lower form of knowledge. In Mahāyāna texts, he became the recipient of the higher wisdom he did not have from the Buddha. His standing was regarded as even lower than that of the other two transmitters of Prajñāpāramitā literature — Subhūti and Pūrna (Conze, 2000a, pp. 6-7)

Lopez Jr. also points out that in the *Heart Sūtra*, Śāriputra, this foremost disciple depicted in Hīnayāna Buddhism is however a person to be taught. This image is entirely consistent with that found in many Prajñāpāramitā literature such as *Fahua jing*《法华经》(*Saddharma-puṇḍárīka-sūtra*) and *Weimo jing*《维摩经》(*Vimalakīrti-nirdeśa-sūtra*), in which he only serves as a set-off figure to Mahāyāna Boddhisattvas. (Lopez Jr., 1988, p. 8) Therefore we have no need to be surprised by Nattier's question as to what role Śāriputra has with his involvement in the *Heart Sūtra*.

9. Conclusions

From the above analysis, we can see that to the question of whether the *Heart Sūtra* is an authentic text we can never give a simple answer. In this article I have dissected the question into a series of issues in a manner which is probably still far from being rigorous. They include:

1. In terms of their origin, early versions of the Chinese *Heart Sūtra* are copied scriptural extracts 抄经. From the perspective of the very rigorous criteria applied by some ancient Chinese bibliographers of Buddhist texts, they even fall within the scope of "apocryphal texts". But from the perspective of most ancient Buddhist scholars, or of contemporary academic criteria, they are merely copies. Judging by its literary attribute, the earliest

Chinese *Heart Sūtra* is not even a *sūtra* but a *dhāraṇī*. In this sense therefore, the question of "apocryphal-ness" does not arise.

2. Chinese *Heart Sūtra* — Kumārajīva version:

   This version is not translated by Kumārajīva. it is not a translated work but a copied extract of the *sūtra*, with its core section copied from the *Large Sūtra* translated by Kumārajīva (or the *Large Sūtra* quoted in the **Mahāprajñāpāramitā-śāstra*《大智度论》), cobbled up with a *dhāraṇī* taken from one of Atikūṭa's translated works. Naturally the Kumārajīva version was finalized later than this work of Atikūṭa. It also appeared later than the Xuanzang *Heart Sūtra*.

3. Chinese *Heart Sūtra* — Xuanzang version:

   This is not a translated text. Even if it is, it would not have been done by Xuanzang himself. But it is indeed probable that he did edit a proto-copy of the *Heart Sūtra* he obtained in Sichuan. About this copy we know nothing for sure. We can only know that it must have consisted two parts: one contains extracts from his *Da boruo jing*《大般若经》, the other a *dhāraṇī*. It is precisely the latter that became the deciding factor for Xuanzang's heavy reliance on the text, and for the high regard the text received from the public in Tang — to them, a "tantricized" Prajñāpāramitā text is of more interest.

4. Chinese *Heart Sūtra* — Other Later Versions:

   Apart from the above two versions, other Chinese versions (including the Chinese transliteration of Sanskrit *Heart Sūtra*) are translated from Sanskrit or Tibetan (of dubious source). They are unquestionably translated works.

5. Sanskrit *Heart Sūtra* — Short-form:

   Syntax-wise the wordings of the extant Sanskrit *Heart Sūtra* have to some extent shown that they have been influenced by Chinese grammar and aesthetic taste, and the text is therefore very "likely" to have been back-translated from Chinese.

However, many questions still remain unresolved. For instance, as my present studies show (cf. §3.3), many doubts remain regarding some of Nattier's proofs used to support her back-translation theory.

Then there is the issue of methodology. The Sanskrit *Heart Sūtra* is not a historically and geographically uniform edition, nor is it a completely homogeneous text. If we were to maintain that it is indeed a back-translation by Xuanzang, or by someone his contemporary, we need to first re-establish the Sanskrit edition of his time before any comparison can be made. But Nattier's article contains no such important foreshadowing 铺垫, and this has placed the comparative analysis 对勘 of the manuscript on a rather shaky footing. And even if we can prove that the extant Sanskrit *Heart Sūtra* is in fact the product of Chinese back-translation, logically we are still unable to completely deny the probable existence of a certain genuine Sanskrit original. This is similar to the case with the *Vimalakīrtinirdeśa Sūtra*. Before the Sanskrit manuscript of this text was discovered at the Potala Palace by Japanese scholars, we did have a Sanskrit version back-translated from Tibetan. Even if errors are spotted in this back-translation, one cannot say for sure that the Sanskrit original never exists [sic]. For the *Heart Sūtra* though such probability is indeed very low [sic].

Furthermore, a supporting logic used in Nattier's article is that the Chinese *Heart Sūtra* predates the Sanskrit *Heart Sūtra*. But logically this is only a necessary condition for the *Heart Sūtra* to be back-translated from Chinese into Sanskrit but not an absolute condition [sic]. In other words, as long as the Sanskrit *Heart Sūtra* predates the Chinese *Heart Sūtra*, back-translation is proven false, but if the situation is the other way round, back-translation is not necessarily proven true. In fact, due to the destructive impact experienced by Indian Buddhism at home, many early Chinese Buddhist texts are without their Sanskrit originals. Even if they do exist, they would generally appear much later than the Chinese texts, but this of course cannot be taken as proofs for their back-translation.

By raising the above doubts, I do not mean to deny that the Sanskrit *Heart Sūtra* is not a back-translation. In fact as I have, it was precisely Nattier's article which addressed the doubts I had when I first read the *Heart Sūtra* many years ago. But even so, I feel prudence is never a bad idea in academic research.

If we take a step back and assume that we have established that this earlier version of the Sanskrit *Heart Sūtra* is a back-translation from Chinese, then the question is: by whom? As I have mentioned in my analysis of the Sanskrit version, although Xuanzang has certainly played an important part in the transmission of the *Heart Sūtra*, and the Sanskrit version does indeed bear obvious signs of back-translation, I personally think the earliest extant Sanskrit version is unlikely to be his translation after considering specific discrepancies including the differences between: the Xuanzang version and the Sanskrit version; the Hōryūji version and the Xuanzang version; and the discrepancies between his Indology background and certain expressions inconsistent with Sanskrit grammars and mode of expression of Prajñāpāramitā literature. If indeed there exists (a back-translation), it would probably be the work of a prolific pilgrim to India, from post-Early Tang, of whom we have little specific knowledge, but who we know at least is not particularly familiar with Sanskrit Prajñāpāramitā literature.

If indeed Xuanzang did not back-translate the *Heart Sūtra*, then what exactly was his role in its transmission? We have many records that point to his association with the *Heart Sūtra*, but equally we can also find very clear evidence that he did not translate it into Chinese (from Sanskrit) nor *vice versa*. How then do we reconcile these differences? All this would require further research in the future.

6. Sanskrit *Heart Sūtra* — Long-form:

   This text evolved from the short-form Sanskrit *Heart Sūtra* and must have been an Indian work. And with the passing of time, the Sanskrit *Heart Sūtra* became more aligned with Indian aesthetic taste apart from increasing its length. In later days, whether short-form or long-form, both became sources of new Chinese translations of the *Heart Sūtra*. But one problem remains unresolved: Under what circumstances did the Sanskrit *Heart Sūtra* increase in scope and size? How specifically did it evolve and along what pattern? These questions, comparing to the previous one, may not be too hard to resolve. I hope I still have the interest and the time in the future (to resolve them), or to see them satisfactorily resolved by other scholars.

7. Background to the Initial Formation of the *Heart Sūtra*:

   The appearance of the *Heart Sūtra* as an independent text occurred at the peak of early Tang at a time when tantric Buddhism was widespread. Thus at its inception, this "*sūtra*" was constructed as a *dhāraṇī* and was regarded as a short tantric text with specific protective and exorcist religious functions. Therefore, against this background, some of the seemingly unreasonable elements (mentioned by Nattier) can be explained with reasonable ease. These elements include: the absence of Subhūti and in his place Avalokiteśvara (because, as mentioned, the core of the *Heart Sūtra* is a *dhāraṇī*, together with other Prajñāpāramitā *dhāraṇī*, it became prevalent after the proliferation of Buddhism, with Avalokiteśvara assuming an over-riding status); the briefness of the *Heart Sūtra* (because, as mentioned, all tantric Prajñāpāramitā texts are brief); and the absence of a standard 3-part format of a *sūtra* (because it is fundamentally not a "*sūtra*" but the then popular form of *dhāraṇī*). With the fading of tantric hues from the spectrum of Chinese Buddhist thought, and with the rise of sects having greater characteristic of Chinese culture — especially Chan (Zen) Buddhism, the non-dualistic Prajñāpāramitā idea of form and emptiness found in the *Heart Sūtra* became increasingly valued by the elites of the Buddhist intelligentsia.

8. The Importance of Cross-lingual Studies to Buddhist Philological Research

Buddhist philological research differs from traditional Chinese philological research. Since many different languages are used in Buddhist sutras, mastering multiple Buddhist scriptural languages becomes crucial in the studies of Buddhist philology. Taking Chinese Buddhist philological research as an example, (we see that) never before has anyone attained such acclaimed depth as Professor Seishi Karashima 辛岛靜志, who can be said to have pointed a refreshingly eye-opening way forward for present and future scholars in terms of (multilingual) methodology. What we have seen in Nattier's studies also shows that through cross-lingual approach, existing blind spots on certain issues hidden in intra-lingual studies can all be exhaustively exposed. Therefore in closing, I would once again appeal to the Chinese Buddhist circle that in the training of young researchers on philology, the foundation must be, and must always be, the learning of scriptural languages.

REFERENCES

Bareau, A., 1955. *Les sectes bouddhiques du petit Véhicule*. *Saigon*: Ecole français d'Extrême-Orient.

Brough, J., 1950. Thus have I heard…. *Bulletin of School of Oriental and African Studies*, vol.13, pp. 416-426.

Burgess J., 1882. *Notes on the Amarāvati Stupa*.

Buswell, Robert J., 1990. *Chinese Buddhist Apocrypha*. University of Hawaii Press.

Conze, E., 1948. Prajñāpāramitā Hṛdaya. *The Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, pp. 34-47.

Conze, E., 1956a. Kauśika prajñāpāramitā-sūtra. *Sino-Indian Studies*, pp. 115-118.

Conze, E., 1956b. Svalpākṣarā prajñāpāramitāsūtra. *Sino-Indian Studies*, vol.2, pp. 113-115.

Conze, E., 1973. *Perfect Wisdom: The Short Prajnaparamita Texts*. Totnes: Buddhist Publishing Group.

Conze, E., 2000a. *The Prajñāpāramitā Literature*. New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal Publishers Pvt.Ltd.

Conze, E., 2000. *Thirty years of Buddhist Studies*. New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal Publishers Pvt.Ltd.

Eckel, M., 1987. Indian Commentaries on the Heart Sūtra: The Politics of Interpretation. *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies*, pp. 69-79.

Hannya, S., 1922-3. Prajñāpāramitā Hṛdaya-Sūtra, Sanskrit and Tibetan Texts. *The Eastern Buddhist*, pp. 163-175.

Hikata, R., 1958. *Suvikrāntavikrāmi-pariprcchā prajñāpāramitā sūtra*. Fukuoka: Kyushu University.

Lamotte, E.,1954. sur la formation du Mahayana. *Asiatica* (Festchrift F. Weller), pp. 381-386.

Lancaster, L., 1977. *Prajnaparamita and Related Systems: Studies in Honour of Edward Conze (Berkeley Buddhist Studies Series 1)*. Group in Buddhist Studies, UC Berkeley.

Leumann, E., 1912. *zur nordarischen Sprache und Literatur*. Strassburg: K.J. Trübner.

Lopez, Jr. Donald S., 1988. *The Heart Sūtra Explained: Indian and Tibetan Commentaries*. ALBANY: State University of New York Press.

McRae, J., 1988. Ch'an Commentaries on the Heart Sūtra: Preliminary Inferenceson the Permutation of Chinese Buddhism. *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies*, vol. 11, No. 2, pp. 87-115.

Migot, A., 1954. Un grand disciple du Buddha: Śāriputra. vol. XLVI, pp. 405-554.

Mironov, N. D., 1927. Buddhist Miscellanea. *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* April, pp. 252-279.

Mironov, N. D., 1961. A List of Fragment of Brahmi Mss. Belonging to Count Ohtani. 西域文化研究第四中央アジア古代語文獻. 京都: 西域文化研究會編, p. 93.

Monier-Williams, 1899. *A Sanskrit-English Dictionary*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.

Müller, F. M., 1881. *Buddhist Texts From Japan*. Clarendon Press.

Müller, F. M., 1884. *Buddhist Texts from Japan*. Clarendon Press.

Nattier, J., 1992. The Heart Sūtra: A Chinese Apocryphal Text? *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies*, vol.15 (2) 1992, pp. 153-223.

Pine, R., 2004. *The Heart Sutra: The Womb of Buddhas*. Washington, D.C: Shoemaker and Hoard.

Ringgren, H., 1947. *word and wisdom, studies in the hypostatization of divine qualities and functions in the Ancient Near East*. Lund: Haken Ohlssons Boktryckeri.

Suzuki D.T., 1934. Essays in Zen Buddhism,III. London: Luzac.

Suzuki D.T., 1935. *Manual of Zen Buddhism*. Kyoto: Eastern Buddhist Society.

Tokuno, K., 1990. The Evaluation of Indigenous Sutras in Chinese Buddhist Bibliographical Catalogues. Hawaii: *Chinese Buddhist Apocrypha*. Univ of Hawaii Press, pp. 31-74.

Tomabechi, T., 2009. *Adhyardhaśatikā Prajñāpāramitā: Sanskrit and Tibetan texts*. Austrian Academy of Sciences Press.

Vaidya, P.L., 1961. Svalpākṣarā prajñāpāramitāsūtra. Mahayanasutrasamgraha I.

Warder A.K., 1970. *Indian Buddhism*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.

Willemen, C., 1973. A Tantric Heart Sūtra. *Samadhi*, pp. 2-11.

Yuyama, A., 1977. *Buddhist though and Asian Civilization*. *Essays in Honor of H. V. Guenther.*, pp. 286-292.

奥風栄弘, 2011. 高貴寺蔵梵文『般若心経』について. 印度學佛教學研究, 卷59(2), pp. 955-952.

曹凌, 2009. 中國佛教疑偽經綜錄. 上海: 上海師范大學碩士論文.

陳玉蛟, 1988.《現觀莊嚴論》初探. 中華佛學學報, 卷 第二卷, pp. 157-204.

程正, 2007. 傳達摩撰『般若波羅蜜多心經頌』の譯注研究. 駒沢大学仏教学部論集., pp. 259-278.

池田溫, 1992. 講座敦煌 5: 敦煌漢文文獻. 東京: 大東出版社.

方广锠, 2006. 中國寫本大藏經研究. 上海: 上海古籍出版社.

福井文雅, 1983. 般若心經觀在中國的變遷. 敦煌學, Issue 6, pp. 17-30.

福井文雅, 1985. 新出「不空訳」梵本写本般若心経. 仏教学論集: 中村瑞隆博士古稀記念論集. 東京: 春秋社, pp. 229-246.

福井文雅, 1987. 般若心経の歴史的研究. 東京: 春秋社.

福井文雅, 2000. 般若心経の総合的研究: 歴史·社会·資料. 東京: 春秋社.

慧立、彥悰, 2000. 大唐大慈恩寺三藏法師傳. 孫毓棠、謝方點校 编辑 北京: 中華書局.

季羡林等校注, 1985. 大唐西域记校注. 北京: 中华书局.

紀贇, 2011. 從口頭到書面 — 佛教文獻傳播方式的改變及大乘佛教的興起. 出处: 2011 佛學研究論文集 — 第一屆國際佛教大藏經學術研討會. 高雄: 佛光山文教基金會, pp. 1-94.

蔣忠新, 1997. 旅順博物館藏梵文《法華經》殘片. 大連市: 旅順博物館、創價學會.

林光明, 2000. 心經集成. 臺北: 嘉豐出版社.

林光明, 2004. 梵藏心經自學. 臺北: 嘉慧出版社.

林韵柔, 2008. 唐代《佛頂尊勝陀羅尼經》的譯傳與信仰. 法鼓佛學學報 第三《心經》.

刘淑芬, 2008. 滅罪與度亡: 佛頂尊勝陀羅尼經幢的研究. 上海: 上海古籍出版社.

落合俊典, 2011. 刑部郎中封無待撰『注心経并序』本文と小考. 国際仏教学大学院大学研究紀要, 5, 卷 15, Hubert Durt 教授退職記念号, pp.1-52.

吕澂, 2005. 印度佛学源流略讲. 上海: 上海人民出版社.

栂尾祥云, 1932. 理趣経の研究. 无出版地: 高野山大學出版部.

梅維恒, 2004.《心經》與《西遊記》的關系. 唐研究, pp. 45-64.

明法比丘, 2007. 攝阿毗達摩義論表解. 无出版地: 法雨道場.

南条文雄, 1979. 懷舊錄. 東京: 平凡社.

平川彰, 2004. 印度佛教史. 台北: 商周出版.

山田龙城, 1977. 梵語佛典の諸文献. 无出版地: 平楽寺書店.

山田龙城, 1988. 梵語佛典導論. 臺北: 華宇出版社.

沈九成, 1988. 般若波羅蜜多心經疏義（二）. 內明, 7, 卷 196, pp. 3-12.

沈九成, 1988. 般若波羅蜜多心經疏義（一）. 內明, 6, 卷 195, pp. 3-13.

释厚重, 2005. 觀音與媽祖. 臺北: 稻田出版有限公司.

万金川, 2004a. 敦煌石室《心經》音寫抄本校釋序說. 中華佛學學報, 卷 17, pp. 95-121.

万金川, 2004b. 石室《音經》音寫抄本校釋初稿之一. 佛學研究中心學報, 卷 9, pp. 77-118.

王紹峰, 2004. 道宣文獻語匯研究. 成都: 四川大學博士後論文.

王文颜, 1997. 佛典疑偽經研究與考錄. 臺北: 文津出版社.

渥德尔, 1987. 印度佛教史. 北京: 商务印书馆.

吴汝钧, 1983. 佛學研究方法論. 臺北: 臺灣學生書局.

吴汝鈞, 1992. 佛教思想大辭典. 臺北: 臺灣商務印書館.

辛岛静志, 1991. 法华经中的乘 (yana) 与智慧 (jnana) —— 大乘佛教中 yana 概念的起源与发展. 出处: 季羡林教授八十华诞纪念论文集. 南昌: 江西人民出版社, pp. 607-643.

辛島靜志, 2009.《法華經》的文獻學研究 —— 觀音的語義解釋. 中華文史論叢, 卷 95, pp. 199-229.

熊娟, 2010. 漢文佛典疑偽經研究. 杭州: 浙江大學博士論文.

徐文堪, 2011.《心經》與《西游記》.《東方早報》之《上海書評》, 1510.

杨廷福, 1988. 玄奘年譜. 北京: 中華書局.

姚永銘, 2003. 慧琳《一切經音義》研究. 南京: 江蘇古籍出版社.

殷光明, 2006. 敦煌壁畫藝術與疑偽經. 北京: 民族出版社.

于君方, 2009. 觀音: 菩薩中國化的演變. 臺北: 法鼓文化.

张淼, 2006. 佛教疑偽經思想研究. 南京: 南京大學博士論文.

Appendix – *Heart Sūtra* in Sanskrit, Chinese and English

Sanskrit (Conze, 2000b)	**Chinese** (Xuanzang, T251)	**English** (Conze 1973)
ārya-avalokiteśvaro bodhisattvo gambhīrāyā□ prajñāpāramitāyā□ caryā□ caramā□o vyavalokayati sma pañca-skandhās tā□ś ca svabhāva- śūnyān paśyati sma.	观自在菩萨行深般若波罗蜜多时 照见五蕴皆空	Avalokita, the Holy Lord and Bodhisattva, was moving in the deep course of the Wisdom which has gone beyond. He looked down from on high, He beheld but five heaps, and He saw that in their own-being they were empty.
——	（度一切苦厄）	——
iha śāriputra rūpa□ śūnyatā śūnyataiva rūpa□ rūpān na p□thak śūnyatā śunyatāyā na p□thag rūpa□ yad rūpa□ sā śūnyatā yā śūnyatā tad rūpa□ evam eva vedanā-sa□jñā-sa□s-kāra-vijñānam.	舍利子 色不异空 空不异色 色即是空 空即是色 受想行识 亦复如是	Here, O Śariputra, form is emptiness and the very emptiness is form; emptiness does not differ from form, nor does form differ from emptiness, whatever is form, that is emptiness; whatever is emptiness, that is form; the same is true of feelings, perceptions, impulses, and consciousness.
iha śāriputra sarva-dharmā□ śūnyatālak□a□ā, anutpannā aniruddhā, amalā avimalā anūna aparipūr□ā□.	舍利子 是諸法空相 不生不灭 不垢不淨 不增不減	Here, O Śariputra, all dharmas are marked with emptiness; they are neither produced nor stopped, neither defiled nor immaculate, neither deficient nor complete.
tasmāc chāriputra śūnyatayā□ na rūpa□ na vedanā na sa□jñā na sa□skārā na vijñānam.	是故空中无色无受想行识	Therefore, O Śariputra, where there is emptiness, there is neither form, nor feeling, nor perception, nor impulse, nor consciousness;
na cak□u□-śrotra-ghrā□a-jihvā-kāya-manā□si. na rūpa-śabda-gandha-rasa- spra□□avya-dharmāh. na cak□ūr-dhātur yāvan na manovijñāna-dhātu□.	无眼耳鼻舌身意 无色声香味触法 无眼界乃至无意识界	no eye, or ear, or nose, or tongue, or body, or mind ; no form, nor sound, nor smell, nor taste, nor touchable or objects of mind; no sight-organ element, etc., until we come to, no mind-consciousness element;

na-avidyā na-avidyā-k□ayo. yāvan na jarāmara□a□ na jarāmara□a-k□ayo na duhkha- samudaya-nirodha-mārgā na jñāna□ na prāptir aprāpti□.	无无明亦无无明尽 乃至无老死 亦无老死尽 无苦集灭道 无智亦无得	There is no ignorance, no extinction of ignorance, etc., until we come to, there is no decay and death, nor extinction of decay and death; There is no suffering, nor origination, nor stopping, nor path. There is no cognition, no attainment and no non-attainment.
tasmāc chāriputra aprāptivād bodhisattvo prajñāpāramitām āśritya viharaty acittāvara□a□. cittāvara□a-nāstitvād atrastro viparyāsa-atikrānto ni□□hā-nirvā□a□.	以无所得故 菩提萨埵依般若波罗蜜多故 心无罣碍 无罣碍故 无有恐怖 远离颠倒梦想 究竟涅槃	Therefore, O Śariputra, owing to a Bodhisattva's indifference to any kind of personal attainment, and through his having relied on the perfection of wisdom, he dwells without thought-coverings. In the absence of thought-coverings he has not been made to tremble, he has overcome what can upset, and in the end sustained by Nirvana.
tryadhva-vyavasthitā□ sarva-buddhā□ prajñāpāramitām āśritya-anuttarā□ samyaksambodhim abhisambuddhā□.	三世诸佛依般若波罗蜜多故 得阿耨多罗三藐三菩提	All those Buddhas who appear in the three periods of time through having relied on the perfection of wisdom they fully awake to the utmost, right and perfect enlightenment.
tasmāj jñātavya□ prajñāpāramitā mahā-mantro mahā-vidyā-mantro 'nuttara-mantro 'samasama-mantra□ sarvadu□kha-praśamana□ satyam amithyatvāt.	故知般若波罗蜜多 是大神咒 是大明咒 是无上咒 是无等等咒 能除一切苦 真实不虚	Therefore one should know the Prajñāpāramita as the great spell, the spell of great knowledge, the utmost spell, the unequalled spell, allayer of all suffering, in truth — for what could go wrong?
prajñāpāramitāyām ukto mantra□. tadyathā o□ gate gate pāragate pārasa□gate bodhi svāhā.	故说般若波罗蜜多咒 即說咒曰： 揭帝揭帝般罗揭帝般罗僧揭帝菩 提萨婆訶	By the Prajñāpāramita has this spell been delivered. It runs like this: GONE, GONE, GONE BEYOND, GONE ALTOGETHER BEYOND, O WHAT AN AWAKENING, ALL-HAIL!