

АКТУАЛЬНЫЕ ПРОБЛЕМЫ ВОСТОКОВЕДЕНИЯ И АФРИКАНИСТИКИ: ДИСКУССИЯ

UDC 930

Stages and perspectives of the development of *Dhāraṇī Studies* as a branch of Buddhist studies

S. Kh. Shomakhmadov

Institute of Oriental Manuscripts of RAS

18, Dvortsovaya emb., St. Petersburg, 191186, Russian Federation

For citation: Shomakhmadov S. Kh. Stages and perspectives of the development of *Dhāraṇī Studies* as a branch of Buddhist studies. *Vestnik of Saint Petersburg University. Asian and African Studies*, 2018, vol. 10, issue 4, pp. 525–535. <https://doi.org/10.21638/spbu13.2018.409>

The author points out the three stages of Dhāraṇī Studies since the beginning of 19th c. up to the present day. Thus, the first stage (the beginning of 19th c. — the first third of the 20th c.) is characterized by the fact that the study of dhāraṇīs' texts occurs within the framework of Buddhist written sources publication in general. The article emphasizes the significant contribution of Acad. V. P. Vasiliev in Dhāraṇī Studies: ideas on the study of Buddhist sacral invocations formulated by Vasiliev, defined the main vectors of Dhāraṇī Studies. The second stage of these Studies (the first third — the end of 20th c.) is marked by a specification — the emphasis of researchers' attention directly on Buddhist written sources containing dhāraṇīs. Analyzing the second period's researchings devoted to Dhāraṇī Studies, the author singled out four main streams: '*Historical*' (the dhāraṇīs' functioning in a certain historical period); '*Cultic*' (praxeological aspect of Buddhist dhāraṇīs); '*Iconographic*' (studies of artifacts connecting with dhāraṇī tradition); '*Conceptual*' (analysis of terminology and concepts associated with the practice of reciting dhāraṇī). The article points out the prospects of using the interdisciplinary method, which allows to use the results of not only adjacent oriental disciplines (Indology — Jan Gonda, Tatiana Elizarenkova), but also to involve methods used in Slavic/Indo-European spells Studies (Vladimir Toporov, Svetlana Tolstaia, Aleksey Iudin).

Keywords: dhāraṇī, mantras, parittā, V.P. Vasiliev, Buddhist iconography, interdisciplinary method.

The study of sacred recitatives (dhāraṇīs and mantras) is undoubtedly a currently one of important fields in modern Buddhist studies. The phenomenon of sacred significance of a verbalized word, which in the case of Buddhism dates back to the time of the com-

position of the Vedic saṃhitās, is a site of special scientific interest of many researchers, amongst which are Tibetan experts, Sinologists, specialists on Japan, and cultural experts of the Southeast Asia. As a rule, each study is preceded by a brief survey of the “available information” on the issue, that is, a summary of basic results achieved by the predecessors. However, despite the recognized popularity of study of Buddhist sacred recitatives, sometimes such historiographical data is non-systematic, based on chronological sequence as almost the only principle of unification. Meanwhile, classification of the research literature devoted to dhāraṇī, as well as identification of the main lines of research into Buddhist sacred formulas on the basis of literature data analysis allow not only for identifying certain aspects of this field in the Buddhist studies, which need closest attention of researchers, but also provide rich material for the historiography of Buddhism in general and for studying dhāraṇī in particular. This article is an attempt to close the gap.

The history of studying the practice of proclaiming Buddhist sacred formulas can be conditionally divided into three stages. The first stage, with the time frame limited to the early 19th century and the first third of the 20th century, is described as the time of the predominantly sporadic interest of specialists in Buddhist Studies in the phenomenon of Buddhist “spells” — dhāraṇī, when these have not yet become an independent object of research. L. Waddell's (1854–1938) article “The “Dhāraṇī” Cult in Buddhism, its Origin, deified Literature and Images” [1], where the British researcher summarizes the experience of the predecessors and establishes the trends for Dhāraṇī Studies, the Western Buddhist studies have been following to the present day.

The second stage falling within the first third to the end of the 20th century was primarily marked by publications and critical editions of a significant number of Buddhist texts containing sacred recitatives. Such a surge in the introduction of written records for scientific use is associated with outstanding archaeological achievements (e.g. the discovery of Buddhist manuscripts near the village of Navapura, known in science as the “Gilgit manuscripts” are noteworthy), as well as with the collapse of the colonial system after World War II, when extensive study of the cultural heritage of the former British colonies, India and Pakistan, began.

The third, for the time being the shortest stage falling within the end of the 20th century and to this day mainly represents the study of certain aspects of the functioning of dhāraṇī in the regions where Buddhist culture is spread — from the use of protective formulas in everyday life to the reflection of the practice of reciting dhāraṇī in the visual arts. Also, this stage is marked by continuity in the implementation of scientific problems that prevailed in previous periods, viz. introduction of literary monuments that were not published before, critical editions (re-editions) of well-known texts, accompanied by the studies that significantly expand knowledge of dhāraṇī.

The Buddhist sacred formulas (both texts containing dhāraṇī, and the practice of proclamation) found their way in the area of expertise of the European scholars as early as the beginning of the 19th century, which, in our opinion, is due to the study of the Chinese versions of Prajñāpāramitā treatises. The French scholar of China Jean-Pierre Abel-Rémusat (1788–1832) was the first to draw attention to dhāraṇī, pointing out that the texts containing Buddhist “spells”, as well as the texts of the Prajñāpāramitā cycle, were not included in the composition of the Buddhist canon Tripiṭaka [2, p. 111]. Following the line of speculation offered by J.-P. Abel-Rémusat, his compatriot, a prominent Buddhist expert in the mid-19th century Eugène Burnouf (1801–1852) suggested that extensive use

of the very term *dhāraṇī*¹ in Buddhist texts started not earlier than Mahāyāna sūtras had appeared [2, p. 494].

We believe it necessary to dwell the contribution made by the outstanding Russian Buddhist studies expert V.P. Vasiliev (1818–1900), because his views stated in the fundamental work “Буддизм, его догматы, история и литература. Часть первая. Общее обозрение [Buddhism, its dogmas, history and literature. First part. Common review]” (1857), in our opinion, largely determined the direction of study of Buddhist sacred formulas in Europe and in the world, which direction has been followed up to the present time, despite the fact that the role of V.P. Vasiliev in the world of Buddhist studies in general and in the *Dhāraṇī* Studies in particular has been underexplored. However, at least the fact that the V.P. Vasiliev’s monograph was translated first into German (1860) [3], and three years later, into French (1863) testifies to the exceptional importance of his work “Buddhism, its Dogmas...” for European Buddhist studies [4].

Agreeing with the views of Jean-Pierre Abel-Rémusat and Eugène Burnouf, V.P. Vasiliev suggested that the introduction of the term *dhāraṇī* into the Buddhist thesaurus was determined by the stage of growing popularity of the Mahāyāna texts [5, p. 142]. We also believe justified his opinion that the definition of a “spell” that had become attributed to *dhāraṇī* could not adequately convey the whole range of interpretations of the term [5, p. 142], and most importantly, it makes the key meaning, which the Buddhist tradition had reserved for it in post-canonical written monuments, remained in the background, i.e. that the *dhāraṇī* is a special state of consciousness, which helps the devotee keep the whole diversity of the Buddhist teachings in his memory². Nevertheless, V.P. Vasiliev attributes the origin of the practice of reciting the Buddhist sacred formulas to the Vedic tradition of proclaiming mantras [5, p. 142], which, for example, in the Atharva Veda function just as the spells designed to ensure success in temporal issues such as getting rid of enemies, diseases, wedding charms, love binding rituals, etc.

The next crucial point in the monograph of V.P. Vasiliev is that the author derives the meaning of the term *dhāraṇī*, which is key to understanding the existence of sacred formulas in the Buddhist tradition, precisely from its semantics, i.e. the Sanskrit word *dhāraṇī* is formed from the verbal root $\sqrt{dhṛ}$, which stands for “to hold, keep; restraint, suppress [the impact of the roots of the bad]; to resist [bad influence]” [6, p. 519]). From the perspective of this interpretation, V.P. Vasiliev has derived the following meanings of the term *dhāraṇī*, which to this day have been supported by virtually all buddhologists all over the world a hundred and fifty years from then; these are (1) comprehension of [all doctrines included in *dhāraṇī*’s formula]; (2) retention [of all teachings]; (3) control [of the newly acquired state of consciousness] [5, p. 143].

¹ It should be mentioned that Eugène Burnouf makes no distinction between the terms “*dhāraṇī*” and “mantra” [2, p.493].

² The problem of relations between mantra and *dhāraṇī*, as well as the legality of the definition of the both terms as spells, is very acute in the Buddhist Studies literature and perhaps is the topic of a separate study. On the one hand, both mantra and *dhāraṇī*, being a means of achievement of quite temporal goods (success in business, protection against natural disasters, robbers, wild animals, etc.), can be defined as “spells”. On the other hand, both terms mark aspects of the religious practice aimed at changing the state of consciousness, leading to implementation of the ultimate goal, i.e. liberation. In both cases, mantra and *dhāraṇī* are synonymous. However, we believe that, unlike mantra, the main “characteristic” of *dhāraṇī* (as it follows from the etymology of this word, as pointed out by V.P. Vasiliev) is *dhāraṇa*, or the *ability of consciousness* to retain, keep and then transmit in an extremely condensed form (of a word or phrase) the lengthy concepts of a doctrine.

Amongst V. P. Vasiliev's outstanding achievements in the field of Dhāraṇī Studies, the "functional" classification of dhāraṇīs can be mentioned, which the Russian Buddhistologist, the first among European researchers, presented on the pages of his monograph, thus indicating the fundamental impossibility of studying Buddhist sacred formulas outside the ritual/praxeological approach. Thus, V. P. Vasiliev distinguishes the so-called "mundane dhāraṇī", which, according to the scholar, are devised "to protect superstitious humanity against fear and miseries" [5, p. 177] ("incantations" against poverty and suffering, epidemics, bad influence of planets, poisonings, bites from venomous snakes and insects, fulfilling desires and granting a long life), as well as "over-mundane dhāraṇī" (V. P. Vasiliev calls them "soteriological" ones) [5, p. 142], "which encompass the practice of pāramitās" and secure a better new birth, deliver from sins and contribute to the attainment of enlightenment [5, p. 178].

V. P. Vasiliev identifies the category of texts containing numerous lists of the names of Buddhas and Bodhisattvas, with dhāraṇī incorporated in proclamation [5, p. 179]. Thus, the Russian Buddhistologist associates this layer of Buddhist texts with the religious custom of worshipping stūpas, statues, etc. [5, p. 179–181]

The paper by L. Waddell published in 1912, which was mentioned in the very beginning, has remained the starting point for many Western studies in the field of dhāraṇī to this day. In his work, Waddell largely follows in line with the monograph by V. P. Vasiliev (in so far as it relates to dhāraṇī), elaborating in detail the positions set forth by the Russian scholar as early as in the middle of the 19th century. However, the British researcher limits himself to a passing reference to his predecessor, saying only that V. P. Vasiliev believed the practice of reciting dhāraṇī preceding the appearance of the actual tantric tradition typically associated with the use of sacred invocations in Buddhism [1, p. 156].

As previously mentioned, L. Waddell, developing V. P. Vasiliev's ideas about non-Buddhist origin of dhāraṇī, points out two possible sources of the origin of the practice of recitation of sacred formulas: according to the British researcher, the first one refers to the use of sacred protective words by Hindustan aborigines — the Drāviḍian tribes, defined by L. Waddell as "idealized fetishes"; the second one is the once-existing Indo-Iranian unity of the tribes of fire-worshippers who used various incantations against unfavorable external factors [1, p. 156, 160–161]. In particular, L. Waddell associates the widespread exclamation *svāhā* with the cult of worship of fire³. Following Eugène Burnouf and V. P. Vasiliev, L. Waddell defines the term dhāraṇī as strictly Buddhist.

L. Waddell made a great step forward as compared with the predecessors by studying the practice of reciting the protective formulas in Buddhism before the "Great Vehicle" appeared. The British explorer analyzes in detail the synonyms for the term dhāraṇī, such as *paritrāṇa*⁴ (Pāli: *paritta*, *parittā*), and *vidyā*⁵. The *parittās* present in many texts of the Pāli Tipiṭaka are sacred formulas that fulfill the function of protecting against the dangers of everyday life. For example, Mora-jātaka *parittās* dedicated to the King of Peacocks (Sanskrit: *māyūra*) are designed to protect against bites from venomous snakes.

³ As a mythological character, *Svāhā* appears as the wife of Agni, according to another version — of Śiva. As V. N. Toporov puts it, in the mythology of ancient India, *Svāhā* "is an interesting example of creating a mythological character and entire mythological story based on ritual usage" [7, p. 420].

⁴ *Paritrāṇa* (Sanskrit); *paritta*, *parittānaṃ* (Pāli) — "defense, preservation, salvation".

⁵ *Vidyā* (Sanskrit) — "knowledge, comprehension, cognition".

An important achievement of L. Waddell's paper is the three-part classification of the periods of development of the Buddhist texts containing sacred protective formulas. The principle underlying the classification is based on the history of the development of the mainstream trends in Buddhism [1, p. 170].

The first period (5th to 2nd centuries BC) is associated with the history of *development of the Pāli Tipiṭaka texts*, that is, it covers the time of the spread of protective parittās. Among the main revered characters of the Buddhist “pantheon”, L. Waddell singles out Maitreya, who was worshiped on a par with some deities of the Vedic pantheon. In the same historical period, the first “incantatory” texts appeared, dedicated to Sahasrapamardini — one of the deities of the “Five Protector Goddesses” cult (Sanskrit: *Pañcarakṣā*). According to the Buddhist tradition, these protective formulas were designed to protect residents of the city of Vaiśālī against various kinds of natural disasters.

The second period (2nd century BC to 4th century AD) coincides in time with the *appearance and dissemination of early Mahāyāna texts* — Prajñāpāramitā literature, where the dhāraṇī represent the encoded aspects of the “Great Vehicle” doctrine. The cults of veneration of Bodhisattvas Avalokiteśvara, Mañjuśrī and Vajrapāṇi come to the forefront. This time is marked by the appearance of key texts for Mahāyāna Buddhism such as Lalitavistara and Lotus Sūtra, already containing the term dhāraṇī.

The third period (from the 5th century AD) is the time of the emergence and flourishing of Buddhism of the “Diamond Vehicle” — *Vajrayāna*, also called *Mantrayāna* — “The Vehicle of Mantras”.

In our opinion, innovative approach is that, for the first time in European Oriental Studies, in his paper L. Waddell studied the algorithm of *deification* of the Buddhist sacred protective formulas, i.e. of “creation” of a deity responsible for the performance of a particular “spell”. L. Waddell distinguishes three aspects of such deification: (1) association of the deity with the doctrine provisions; (2) deification of ethical provisions; (3) names of the texts [1, p. 175–192].

As previously noted, L. Waddell's article somewhat sums up the previous tradition of studying Buddhist sacred recitatives. The directions outlined by the British researcher have become the key ones in the works of the Buddhologists of the successive generations.

The first third of the 20th century was marked by extensive introduction of Buddhist written sources containing dhāraṇī for scientific use. As we see it, this is due to outstanding archaeological discoveries in Central Asia (East Turkestan) and in the north of Hindustan (Gilgit) at the beginning of the 20th century, where the artifacts of Buddhist culture in the places of locations of the great centers of the Great Silk Road in the ancient times, have been found. However, this was preceded by publications in the late 19th and early 20th centuries of some key texts of Buddhist writing, with the practice of reciting dhāraṇī clearly presented.

The beginning of the publication of written sources containing Buddhist dhāraṇī can be dated back to 1884, when the leading world buddhologists of that time such as M. Müller, B. Nanjo and G. Bühler published the texts “Prajñāpāramitā-hṛdaya-sūtra” and “Uṣṇīṣavijaya-dhāraṇī” from East Turkestan. In 1892–1904, fragments from Pañcarakṣā, “Avalokiteśvara-hṛdaya” and “Buddha-hṛdaya”, prepared by S. F. Oldenburg came out. In 1897, R. Hörnle published the famous “Bower Manuscript” acquired as early as in 1890 in the Kuča oasis by the British officer G. Bower, which manuscript represents an extensive treatise on medicine and contains dhāraṇī addressed to the deity Mahāmāyūrī, one of the

names of the “Five Protector Goddesses” (Pañcarakṣā), where Buddhist “spells” are presented as an effective remedy against the bites from venomous snakes.

In 1937–38, the Japanese Buddhologist Yu. Iwamoto also published texts dwelling on the cult of “Five Protector Goddesses”, as well as literary monuments such as “Vajravīdāraṇā-nāma-dhāraṇī-hṛdayopahṛdaya-mūla-sūtra” and “Gaṇapatiḥṛdaya”. In 1939, the results of the orchestrated efforts of Indian scholars transliterating the manuscripts discovered during archaeological excavations near the village of Naupur (Navapura) were published; the edition published under the editorship of N. Dutt was named “Gilgit manuscripts”. The first volume of the publication included the texts containing dhāraṇī, such as “*Bhaiṣajyaguru-sūtra*”, “*Ekādaśamukha-hṛdaya*” and “*Hayagrīva-vidyā*”.

The same period includes publications of two written sources related to the practice of recitation of sacred formulas, very important for the Buddhist tradition. It is referred to “*Sādhanamālā*” and “*Niṣpannayogāvalī*” published by B. Bhattacharya at different times. The said texts describe the ways to visualize the characters of the “Five Protector Goddesses”, reflecting the period of development of this cult, when personification of protective formulas has been already finalized.

At the same time, it should be noted that this time span (from the end of the 19th century to the first third of the 20th century) can hardly be described as a systematic publication of Buddhist written sources containing dhāraṇī. In this case, it is advisable to mention extensive publication of the Oriental written heritage as a whole, when such famous book series as “Sacred Books of the East”, “Sacred Books of Buddhism”, publications of the “Pali Text Society”, the Russian series “Bibliotheca Buddhica” were published. Moreover, the Buddhist texts referring to the tradition of proclaiming sacred formulas were published exclusively within the framework of this general publishing activity.

In our view, specification, which is the focus of the research immediately on written sources containing Buddhist “spells”, is observed in the second half of the 20th century, and, in fact, to the present day. Among the most prominent critical editions of written sources where dhāraṇī are presented, the “Hevajra-tantra” edition prepared by David Snellgrove (1959), and “Sarvadurgati-parīśodhana-tantra” published by T. Skorupsky (1983) should be mentioned. In the second half of the 20th century, the “spells” related to the cult of “Five Protector Goddesses” are still of immediate interest: in 1972, the Japanese Buddhologist Sh. Takubo published the text “*Mahāmāyūrī-vidyārājñī*”, and in 1994 P. Skilling published “*Mahāmantrānusāriṇī-sūtra*”.

The Russian Sanskrit paleographers G. M. Bongard-Levin, M. I. Vorobyova-Desyatovskaya and E. N. Tyomkin have performed outstanding work on the introduction for scientific use of the written sources containing dhāraṇī, discovered and acquired during the expeditions of Russian researchers to Central Asia. For almost twenty years, from 1985 to 2004, they have published three volumes of the “Памятники индийской письменности из Центральной Азии [Monuments of the Indian Script from Central Asia]”, introducing a lot of unique texts and fragments in Sanskrit from East Turkestan into scientific literature.

The second volume of the publication (1990) contains fragments of the so-called *Buddha-nama-sutra* text widespread in the area of Buddhist culture, which lists the Buddha's epithet names accompanied by the dhāraṇī. The third volume of the “Monuments of the Indian Script from Central Asia” published in 2004, in addition to non-published fragments of Buddhist “spells” includes the reprint of dhāraṇī published by S. F. Oldenburg.

As was stated at the beginning of this article, the third, newest stage of Dhāraṇī Studies, which can be dated to the turn of the 20th and 21st centuries, is characterized, firstly, by the continuing release of critical editions of particular texts containing dhāraṇī. Thus, in 2012, G. Hidas published a comparative study of five known versions of the text Mahāpratāsara-vidyārājñī (in Sanskrit, Chinese, Tibetan, Uighur, and Mongolian) dedicated to the central deity of the “Five Protector Goddesses”. The scholar reviewed composition and content of the monument, and the functioning of dhāraṇī within the text. Secondly, the main line of research into Buddhist sacred recitatives, which was founded as early as in the middle of the 19th — early 20th centuries by V. P. Vasiliev and L. Waddell, continued in R. Davidson [8; 9; 10] and R. Payne’s [11] works. The total amount of scientific literature touching on this “speculative” aspect of the study of dhāraṇī can be divided into four directions.

1. “*Historical*” direction includes the works reviewing the existence of dhāraṇī in a certain historical era in a certain region of Buddhist culture. Here, the studies performed by P. Kopp [12] and M. Willis [13] are noteworthy.
2. “*Cultic*” direction is presented by researching the practice of proclaiming Buddhist sacred formulas in performance of acts of worship. R. Davidson’s article “Some Observations on the Uṣṇīṣa Abhiṣeka Rites in Atikūṭa’s Dhāraṇīsamgraha” (2012) [14].
3. “*Iconographic*” direction is developed by works focused on the images of different Buddhas and Bodhisattvas, which are the objects of worship in dhāraṇī texts. The most popular objects of worship were Uṣṇīṣavijaya, Avalokiteśvara, and also the deities of the cult of “Five Protector Goddesses”. For this direction, worthy of mention are the articles published by the German orientalist G. Mevissen [15; 16; 17].
4. “*Conceptual*” direction, analyzing terminology, notions and concepts related to the practice of dhāraṇī recitation, is represented, we suppose, by the largest number of research literature, exemplified by the works of R. Davidson mentioned above [8; 9; 10].

In conclusion, it is necessary to make a few remarks on the prospects for interdisciplinary approach, which has been actively taken lately: the rich experience accumulated, for instance, within the anthropology of religion, ethnology (cultural anthropology), and in other oriental disciplines (Indology) is applicable in Buddhist Studies in general and in the sphere of Dhāraṇī Studies in particular.

In the aspect of studying the sacred recitatives of the Vedic saṃhitās, first and foremost, the classical works of J. Gonda [18; 19], T. Ya. Elizarenkova [20], V. N. Toporov [21] should be mentioned. Thus, according to V. N. Toporov, the idea of the sacred status of the Word as a mediator between the Thought and the Action arose at the very beginning of the forming of the Vedic tradition [21, p. 13]. Therefore, already in the Vedic period, *perception* (listening), *preservation* (retention) and *dissemination* (transmission, teaching) of the true knowledge were closely connected with speech and consciousness (retention of what was heard), which, as we see it, corresponds to the definition of the term of dhāraṇī offered by V. P. Vasiliev.

When studying the area of expertise under consideration, it is also necessary to turn to the findings of a study of the Indian linguistic and philosophical tradition (study of the works of Bhartṛhari, Puṇya-rāja, Patañjali). Among the rich body of research literature touching upon the written heritage of the grammarian Bhartṛhari, as well as upon the po-

lemics between Vyākaraṇa and Mīmāṃsā schools on the sentence's nature, we would like to highlight the works of H. Coward [22; 23] and V. P. Ivanov [24; 25; 26; 27; 28; 29]. Conclusions the above Indologists arrive in their studies as to the sacred function of speech in the Indian tradition can be used in the analysis of Buddhist dhāraṇī.

On the one hand, according to the viewpoint of the Mīmāṃsā school which believed the sounds of the Vedic mantras a sort of manifestations of the Divine Universal Principle, the establishment of a link between ideas, material objects and the names to designate them determines taking power over objects and phenomena through properly pronounced mantra spells. On the other hand, the *sphoṭa-prātibha* pair defined by the Vyākaraṇa theorists allows simultaneous translation and perception of the integral meaning of the utterance (sacred text, teaching), which can be expressed in every element of the utterance, during the process of recitation. We think it is very important to consider both provisions in Dhāraṇī Studies.

Using the methodology employed in the study of incantations and spells, for example, in the Slavic tradition, also significantly contributes to the analysis of dhāraṇī, which, naturally, can only be called “spells” just on a provisional basis. However, at the popular level, functioning of Buddhist sacred recitatives bears a certain resemblance to folk spells. Works by V. N. Toporov [21], S. M. Tolstaia [30; 31], A. V. Yudin [32] may provide significant assistance in this respect.

Thus, S. M. Tolstaia, in studying Slavic spells, identifies five participants in the sacred recitative: (1) *the subject*, or the immediate performer and the “assistants” he addresses (Trinity, Mother of God, saints, forces of nature, etc.); (2) *the object* — ailments and disasters to be eliminated (negative), as well as the benefits to be invited (positive); (3) *the addressee*, or the beneficiary of the spell (also may be animals and inanimate objects); (4) *the means*, or the tools required to implement the plan; (5) *the outside world*, or the everyday life circumstances the desired situation is projected [30, p. 214–242].

We believe that this scheme can be also applied to the analysis of Buddhist dhāraṇī. For example, in “Sarasvatī-parivarta”, the VIII section of the “Golden Light Sutra” (“Suvarṇaprabhāsa-sūtra”) — a story is presented where the goddess Sarasvatī explains the ritual of worship to herself [33, p. 55–59]. This fragment is interesting in that it completely corresponds to the spell description scheme used by S. M. Tolstaia. Thus, Buddha, Sarasvatī herself, the numerous gods and Kauṇḍinya addressing to Sarasvatī undoubtedly represent the “subject”. The “positive object”, that is, the blessings to be gained, as we see it, are eloquence, enlightenment, dhāraṇī for perfect memory, wisdom, unlimited merit, and success in everyday affairs. The part of the “negative object” is played by suffering, miseries caused by the planets, quarrels or discords, misfortunes caused by evil spirits (kakhordas, vetālas, etc.). The addressees of the “spell” addressed to Sarasvatī, are a monk-preacher of Dharma, living beings: monks, nuns, laity, who worship the “Golden Light Sutra”, and Kauṇḍinya. The “means” include mantras, medicinal plants, maṇḍala, musical instruments, and so on, and the “outside world” is the realm of all living beings (Kāma-loka).

Thus, for more than two hundred years of Dhāraṇī Studies, two main directions in the field of Buddhist studies have formed: (1) critical editions of written records containing Buddhist sacred recitatives preceded by a comprehensive analysis of the material, and (2) study of theoretical issues concerning the practice of proclamation dhāraṇī, including historical, cultic, iconographic and “conceptual” aspects. The importance of an interdis-

ciplinary approach that combines the results of research in the field of anthropology of religion, ethnography, folklore and makes it possible to study of Buddhist dhāraṇī at a qualitatively different, higher level also should be mentioned.

References

1. Waddell L.A. The “Dhāraṇī” Cult in Buddhism, its Origin, deified Literature and Images. *Ostasiatische Zeitschrift*. Berlin, Oesterheld, 1912, vol. I, no. 2, pp. 155–195.
2. Burnouf E. *Introduction to the history of Indian Buddhism*. Tr. into English by K. Buffetrille and D.S. Lopez Jr. Chicago, London, The University of Chicago Press, 2010. 616 p.
3. Wassiljew W. *Der Buddhismus, seine Dogmen, Geschichte und Literatur*. Aus dem Russischen übers. [von Theodor Benfey]. Theil 1: Allgemeine Uebersicht. St. Petersburg, Kaiserliche Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1860. XV. 380 p.
4. Vassiliev V. *Le Bouddhisme: ses dogmes, son histoire et sa littérature*. Trad. du russe par G. A. La Comme et précédé d'un discours préliminaire par Éd. Laboulaye. Partie 1: Aperçu général. Paris, Durand; Duprat, 1863. xxxv. 362 p.
5. Vasiliev V.P. *Buddizm, ego dogmati, istoriia i literature. Chast pervaja. Obscheie obozreniie* [Buddhism, its dogmas, history and literature. First part. Common review]. Sankt-Peterburg, 1857. 368 p. (In Russian)
6. Monier-Williams M. *A Sanskrit-English Dictionary etymologically and philologically arranged with special reference to cognate Indo-European Languages*. Delhi, Motilal Banarsidass, 1997. 1333 p.
7. Toporov V.N. Svaha [Svāhā]. *Mifi narodov mira. Entsiklopediia* [Myths of nations of the World. Encyclopaedia] in 2 vols. Ed. by S. A. Tokarev, vol. 2. Moscow, 1997, vol. 2. 420 p. (in Russian)
8. Davidson R. M. Studies in Dhāraṇī Literature I: Revisiting the Meaning of the Term Dhāraṇī. *Journal of Indian Philosophy*, 2009, no. 37 (2), pp. 97–147.
9. Davidson R. M. Studies in Dhāraṇī Literature II: Pragmatics of Dhāraṇī. *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*, February 2014, vol. 77, iss. 01, pp. 5–61.
10. Davidson R. M. Studies in Dhāraṇī Literature III: Seeking the Parameters of a Dhāraṇī-ṭīṭaka, the Formation of the Dhāraṇīsaṃgrahas, and the Place of the Seven Buddhas. *Scripture: Canon: Text: Context. Essays Honoring Lewis Lancaster*. Ed. by Richard Payne. Berkeley, BDK America, 2014, pp. 119–181.
11. Payne R. K. Ritual Syntax and Cognitive Theory. *Pacific World: Journal of the Institute of Buddhist Studies*, Third Series, no. 6, pp. 195–227.
12. Copp P. Notes on the term ‘Dhāraṇī’ in medieval Chinese Buddhist thought. *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*, 2008, vol. 71, issue 3, pp. 493–508.
13. Willis M. Avalokiteśvara of the Six Syllables: Locating the Practice of the “Great Vehicle” in the Landscape of Central India. *Bulletin of the Asia Institute New Series*, 2009, vol. 23, pp. 221–229.
14. Davidson R. M. Some Observations on the Uṣṇīṣa Abhiṣeka Rites in Atikūṭa’s Dhāraṇīsaṃgraha. *Transformations and Transfer of Tantra in Asia and Beyond*. Ed. by István Keul. Berlin-Boston, De Gruyter, 2012, pp. 77–97.
15. Mevissen Gerd J.R. Studies in Pañcarakṣā Manuscript Painting. *Berliner Indologische Studien*. Berlin, 1989, Band 4/5, pp. 339–374.
16. Mevissen Gerd J.R. The Indian Connection: Images of Deified Spells in the Arts of Northern Buddhism, Part I. *Silk Road Art and Archaeology-1*. Kamakura, 1990, pp. 227–246.
17. Mevissen Gerd J.R. The Indian Connection: Images of Deified Spells in the Arts of Northern Buddhism, Part II. *Silk Road Art and Archaeology-2*. Kamakura, 1991–92, pp. 351–382.
18. Gonda J. *The Ritual Sūtras*. Wiesbaden, Otto Harrassowitz, 1977. 684 p.
19. Gonda J. *Vedic Ritual: the Non-Solemn Rites*. Leiden, Köln, E. J. Brill, 1980. 516 p.
20. Elizarenkova T. Ya. Ob Atharvavede [On Atharvaveda]. *Atharvaveda. Izbrannoie* [Atharvaveda. Selected parts]. Translation, comments and Introduction by T. Ya. Elizarenkova. Moscow, Publishing firm “Vostochnaia literatura”, 1995, pp. 3–56. (In Russian)
21. Toporov V.N. Ob indoievropeiskoi zagovornoj traditsii (izbranniie glavi) [On Indo-European spell tradition (selected chapters)]. *Issledovaniia v oblasti balto-slavianskoi duhovnoi kulturi. Zagovor* [The researchers in the sphere of Baltic-Slavic spiritual culture. Spell]. Moscow, Nauka, 1993, pp. 3–103. (In Russian)

22. Coward H. G. The Meaning and power of Mantras in Bhartṛhari's Vākyapadīya. *Understanding Mantras*. Ed. by Alper H. P. Delhi, Motilal Banarsidass, 1989, pp. 165–176.
23. Coward H. G. *The Sphoṭa Theory of Language. A Philosophical Analysis*. Delhi, Motilal Banarsidass, 1997. 180 p.
24. Ivanov V. P. Vidyā and Avidyā in Bhartṛhari's Vākyapadīya. *Bhartṛhari: Language, Thought and Reality (Proceeding of the International Seminar)*. Delhi, December 12–14, 2003. Ed. by M. Chaturvedi. Delhi, Motilal Banarsidass, 2003, pp. 253–258.
25. Ivanov V. P. 'Atomizm' v zvukovih postroieniiah indiiskoi tantri ['Atomism' in the sonic constructions of Indian Tantra]. *Voprosi filosofii [Questions of Philosophy]*, 2014, no. 6, pp. 135–138. (In Russian)
26. Ivanov V. P. Klassifikatsiia opredelenii predlozheniia Puniaradzhi vo vtoroi chasti "Vakiapadii" Bhartrhari [The classification of definitions of the sentence of Puṅyarāja in the Second Part of "Vākyapadīya" of Bhartṛhari]. *Shabdaprakasha. Zografskii sbornik [Śabdaprakāśa. Zograf Digest]*, no. 1. St. Petersburg: Publishing house "LEMA", 2011, pp. 157–174. (In Russian)
27. Ivanov V. P. "Sarva-darshana-sangraha". "Panini-darshana" ["Sarva-darśana-saṃgraha". "Pāṇini-darśana"]. *Istoriia filosofii [The history of philosophy]*, 2000, no. 7, pp. 201–230. (In Russian)
28. Ivanov V. P. Pratibha i sphota v Vakiapadii Bhartrhari [Pratibhā and sphoṭa in Vākyapadīya of Bhartṛhari]. *Vostokovedeniie: Filologicheskie issledovaniia [Oriental Studies. Philological Researches]*, vol. 22. St. Petersburg, The publishing house of St. Petersburg State Univ., 2002, pp. 89–96. (In Russian)
29. Ivanov V. P. Chast i tseloie v lingvofilosofskih modeliah traditsii kashmirskogo shivaizma [Part and whole in the lingual-philosophical models of the tradition of Kashmirian Śaivism]. *Piatie vostokovednie chteniia pamiati O. O. Rozenberga. Trudi uchastnikov nauchnoi konferentsii [The Fifth Orientalist Seminar in memory of O. O. Rosenberg. The papers of participants of the conference]*. St. Petersburg, Publishing house of A. Golod, 2012, pp. 97–113. (In Russian)
30. Tolstaia S. M. Zagovori [Spells]. *Slavianskie drevnosti: Etnolingvisticheskii slovar [Slavic antiquities: Ethno-linguistic Dictionary]*, vol. 2. Moscow, Institut slavianovedeniia RAN, 1999, pp. 239–244.
31. Tolstaia S. M. Zaklinaniia [Incantations]. *Slavianskie drevnosti: Etnolingvisticheskii slovar [Slavic antiquities: Ethno-linguistic Dictionary]*, vol. 2. Moscow, Institut slavianovedeniia RAN, 1999, pp. 258–260.
32. Iudin A. V. *Onomastikon russkikh zagovorov. Imena sobstvenniie v russkom magicheskom folklore [The Onomasticon of Russian Spells. Proper names in the Russian magic folklore]*. Moscow, Moskovskii obschestvennii nauchnii fond, 1997. 319 p.
33. Bagchi S. (ed.) *Suvarṇaprabhāsasūtram*. Darbhanga, Mithila Institute of Post-Graduate Studies and Research in Sanskrit Learning, 1967. 128 p.

Received: June 4, 2018

Accepted: September 17, 2018

Author's information:

Safarali Kh. Shomakhmadov — PhD of Historical Sciences, Senior Researcher; safaralihshom@mail.ru

Этапы и перспективы развития изучения дхарани (*Dhāraṇī Studies*) как отрасли буддологии

С. Х. Шомакмадов

Институт восточных рукописей РАН,
Российская Федерация, 191186, Санкт-Петербург, Дворцовая наб., 18

Для цитирования: Shomakhmadov S. Kh. Stages and perspectives of the development of *Dhāraṇī Studies* as a branch of Buddhist studies // Вестник Санкт-Петербургского университета. Востоковедение и африканистика. 2018. Т. 10. Вып. 4. С. 525–535. <https://doi.org/10.21638/spbu13.2018.409>

Статья посвящена анализу смены методологических подходов к изучению практики рецитации сакральных возгласений (*дхарани*) в буддизме. Автор статьи выделяет три

этапа изучения буддийских сакральных речитативов с нач. XIX в. вплоть до наших дней. Так, первый этап (нач. XIX в. — первая треть XX в.) характеризуется тем, что изучение текстов, содержащих дхарани, происходит в рамках публикации буддийских письменных памятников в целом. Автор статьи указывает на значительный вклад акад. В. П. Васильева в изучение дхарани: идеи относительно изучения буддийских речитативов, сформулированные В. П. Васильевым, определили основные векторы изучения дхарани. Второй этап изучения сакральных изречений (первая треть — конец XX в.) отмечен спецификацией — акцентированием внимания исследователей непосредственно на письменных памятниках, содержащих дхарани. При анализе данного периода автор статьи выделил четыре основных направления современной исследовательской литературы, посвященной изучению практики возгласания буддийских сакральных формул: *историческое* (функционирование дхарани в определенный исторический период); *культовое* (праксеологический аспект буддийских сакральных речитативов); *иконографическое* (исследования образов объектов поклонения, упоминаемых в дхаранических текстах); *«концептуальное»* (анализ терминологии, понятий, концепций, связанных с практикой рецитации дхарани). Автор статьи указывает на перспективность использования междисциплинарного подхода, позволяющего при изучении буддийских дхарани не только использовать результаты смежных востоковедных дисциплин (индологии — Я. Гонда, Т. Я. Елизаренкова), но и привлекать методы, применяемые при изучении заговоров и заклинаний в славянской традиции (В. Н. Топоров, С. М. Толстая, А. В. Юдин).

Ключевые слова: дхарани, мантра, паритта, В. П. Васильев, буддийская иконография, междисциплинарный подход.

Контактная информация:

Шомахмадов Сафарали Хайбуллоевич — канд. ист. наук, ст. науч. сотр.; safaralihshom@mail.ru