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Two New Fragments of Buddhist Sanskrit Manuscripts from Central Asia

By Richard Salomon and Collett Cox

I. Introduction

The two manuscript fragments presented below were reported in Huang 1983, p. 51 and illustrated there in plates XXXVI and XXXVII. They are said there to have been found at the site at Ruòqiang (Charkhlik, a), southeast of the Tarim Basin in the Xinjiang-Uighur Autonomous Region of the People’s Republic of China. Paleographically these fragments resemble most closely Sander’s Gupta alphabet type A,f (Sander 1968, Tafeln 9–20), dating from the 3rd-4th centuries A.D.; note for example the forms of a and sa in fragment 2, and ka, without a curved tail at the bottom, in both fragments. The script of no. 1 may be slightly later that that of no. 2, and in some respects resembles Sander’s Gupta B,h (4th-5th centuries A.D.), for instance in the shape of a and sa. Both fragments may thus be dated around the 4th century A.D.; possibly a little earlier in the case of no. 2, a little later in no. 1.

Both fragments are clearly written and reasonably accurate, though there are some scribal errors such as omission of vowel signs and visarga, deletion of one element of a consonant conjunct, confusion of dentals and retroflexes, etc. All of these are more or less obvious and typical of central Asian Sankrit manuscripts, and have been emended in square brackets with asterisks.
Fragment no. 1 (Fig. 1) consists of a single leaf of a paper manuscript, measuring 10 × 2.5 cm. It is mostly intact except for the left edge and a portion broken away at the upper right (recto), so that a few *akṣaras* at the beginning of each line and in the last quarter of the first and last verses are missing. (Missing *akṣaras* are indicated by X; portions of missing *akṣaras* by -. Where possible, conjectural restorations of the missing portions are indicated in the translation.) There are five lines of writing on each side, each line corresponding to a single verse in *anuṣṭubh* (*śloka*) meter, with a space in the middle between hemistichs. The verses, 10 in all, are not numbered.

**Recto**

1) X-ac(i)nt(ya?)dbhutaguṇe tvayi kalyaṇacetasi /
   vikkriyāṁ nāspadaṁ lebhe yathā dh(i?)XX-mmat(a) /

2) XXX-eṣṭate kaścit tvayy asādhu tam eva tu /
   kṛpāyasedhikataram mātevātmajam āturum /

3) XXXkāṇapekṣīdaṁ svaduḥkaikāturam jagat /
   tvam svaduḥkhāny anāḍṛtya paraduḥkhāturāḥ sadā /
Recto

1) In you, with your holy mind and inconceivably (\(?; [*a]c(i)nt(y)a\)) wondrous virtues, perturbation (read *vikkriyā for vikkriyām\?) found no place, like...  
2) [*Even if] someone does (*yadyapi *cetā) ill to you, you pity him all the more, as a mother does her sick child.  
3) This world has no care for the sorrows [*of others] (*para-duḥkhānapekṣi) and is afflicted by its own; you disregard your own sorrows and are always afflicted by those of others.  
4) The joy which you (felt), Holy One, in [*dispelling] the sorrows [*of others] (*paresāṁ *vyasya duḥkha) even at the cost of your own life; even they (the others) did not (feel) so great (a joy).  
5) This world is not pained [*by its own afflictions] (*svārtibhir eva) loko 'yam) as much as you, with your tenderly compassionate heart are pained by the afflictions of others.

Verso

1) [*For you] whose mind is filled with compassion, there was no (*na te kīmīcid a)\(\text{[bh]uc chatrau}\) difference in the kindness (shown) to an enemy or to a son, any more than to your left or right eye.  
2) ...would carry on the head even the footdust of the Sage, of
you whose every action bespeaks [ṣ udgārī] the touchstone of compassion.

3) Even when tormented and cut to pieces again and again, [*your body?] ([*tvaddeha]ḥ?) did not undergo perturbation [vikkriyāṃ], O Steadfast One, like the moon when obscured by an eclipse.

4) In the whirlpool of evil [*of saṃśāra] ([*saṃsāra]uyasanāvarte), (your) compassion, tender to (all) beings, never once abandoned you, any more than the nature of things could abandon the things themselves.

5) Faults such as impatience could not affect you, who were... and always dedicated...

Although we have not succeeded in identifying the text with any previously published stotra, it closely resembles in both style and content several other Sanskrit poems of this class, such as the Varnārha varna and Satapancāsatha or Adhyardhāsataka attributed to Mātrceṇa, which have been published from manuscript fragments found in central Asia (see Schlingloff 1955 and 1968; Shackleton Bailey 1951). The following instances are characteristic:

With R2cd, krpayasedhikataram mātevātmajam āturan and V4bc, karunā satavatatalal / na tatyāja kṣanam api, compare verse 10cd of the Rāhulastava (Schlingloff 1955 p. 90), karunā tvā na tatyāja mātā sutam ivaurasam.

With R3ab, [*paradūḥ]khānapeksīdaṃ svaduhkaikāturam jagat, compare Rāhulastava 6ab (Schlingloff 1955 p. 89), parāthe niravekṣasya janasyātmamāmbharer iha.

With R4, [*paresām vyāsya duḥkhāni svapraṅātvayayair api / ya te prītir abhūt sādho sā tēṣām api na ifājvat, compare Satapancāsatha 17 (Shackleton Bailey 1951 p. 46), parāthe tyajatah prānān yā prītir abhavat taval / na sa naśtopalabdhesu prānīṣu prānīṃm bhavet II.

With V1ab, [*na te kiṃcid a](bh)uc chatrau putre vānugrabhāntaram, compare Munayastava 7ab (Schlingloff 1955 p. 86), vadhakāpatayor yaśa manas tulyam pravartate.

With V3b, cchidyamānopī cāsakṛt, compare Satapancāsatha 18b (Shackleton Bailey 1951 p. 47), cchidyamānasya te 'sakṛt.

With V5a, . . .nityānubaddhaṃ ca tvāṃ, cf. Satapancāsatha 22c (Shackleton Bailey 1951 p. 50), na te nityānubaddhasya.

Further parallels could be cited, but these examples should suf-
fice to demonstrate the close similarity of the new fragment to the known stotras. In particular, the closest resemblances seem to be with the anonymous Rāhulastava and with Mātrceṭa’s Śatapaṇcāsātka (especially the Hetustava portion, verses 10–26). The fragment is thus almost certainly from a stotra, previously undiscovered as far as we have been able to determine, of the school of Mātrceṭa; whether by Mātrceṭa himself or by an imitator we cannot say for sure, although if the latter it is a good imitation of the master’s style.

III. Fragment of an Abhidharma Text

Fragment no. 2 (Fig. 2), part of an Abhidharma text, is on palm leaf and measures 8.7 by 1.3 cm., with three lines on each side. It is complete except for a break at the upper left (of the recto), with four or five akārās missing from the beginning of line R1 = V3. In the left margin of the recto is a numerical sign, apparently 40, indicating the number of the folio.

Recto

1). X X X X rta(?)vatīti kecit tāvad āhuḥ dvividham kuśalam
sāsraṃ cānaśravāṃ ca tatra ya[t*]
2). sāsraṃ tad upādāyatīti athavā dvividham kusālam [sic] upadhīphalam visāmyoga-
3). phalam ca tatrpadhīphalam upā[da*]nakam iti atrocyate neha vipākahetuḥ pari-

Verso
1). kṣyate upapattihetur iha parikṣyate sa ca [a*]kusalah atrāha yady upapattihetur akuśa-
2). lasyāna [read -laḥ syān na] kaścid rūpārupypadhātur up-apadyeta iti tad dhi tatra kuśalam astīti
3). -o-e X X -āstīti uktam hi bhagavatā viviktaḥ kāmesv iti atrocyate na vayaṃ

Translation

Recto
1). . . . Now, some say, “The virtuous is twofold, with contamination and without contamination. Of those, that which
2). is with contamination furthers attachment.” Or, “The virtuous is twofold, resulting in a substratum, and resulting
3). in disconnection. Of these, the one resulting in a substratum is the basis of attachment.” To this it is said, “It is not the
cause of maturation that is being examined here;

Verso
1). it is the cause of rebirth that is being examined here; and that is [un]virtuous.” To this one [might] say, “If the cause
of rebirth were unvirtuous,
2). no realm of form nor formless realm would arise at all; for that is virtuous there,
3). . . . is . . . For the Lord has said, ‘One is free from desires.’”
To this it is said, “We do not . . .

Both the style and content of this fragment suggest that it is from a Buddhist Abhidharma commentarial treatise. Though efforts to locate the passage in any extant Sanskrit text or fragment, or any Chinese translation were unsuccessful, there is a marked similarity in style to two fragments discovered at Kucha, which were published by E. Waldschmidt. (Waldschmidt 1965 #15, #18, pp. 9–12) All three fragments are written in the form
of a dialogue in which the views of the proponent are indicated by the phrase *atrocyate*, and those of the opponent(s) by *kecid āhub, atrāha*, etc. Both parties employ argument and scriptural citations as authorities in support of their positions. Further, all three fragments treat a relatively sophisticated point of doctrinal controversy. The dialogical expository style and complexity of doctrinal investigations suggest an Abhidharma text of the middle or later period, that is, contemporaneous with or following the initial compilation of the *Vibhāṣā* compendia (c. 2nd century A.D.) (Lamotte 1958 p. 648; see Kimura 1937 pp. 207ff).

Although neither the specific topic under discussion in this fragment nor the sectarian affiliation of either party is explicitly identified, the following doctrinal issues suggest that the topic is probably *karma*, or possibly *citta*, and at least one statement by the opponent (V. 1–3) is fully consistent with Kashmiri Sarvāstivāda-Vaibhāṣika doctrinal positions:

1). **R1** The two categories of contaminated, *sāsraya*, and uncontaminated, *anāsraya*, are used to classify all *dharmas* in an early Abhidharma text, the *Śariputra-bhidharmasāstra* (ŚAS 1 p. 527.b.23ff), and become common in Abhidharma texts from the middle period on. (PP 5 p. 711.b.9; JP T.26.1544 2 p. 926.a.11ff; MVB 76 p. 391.c.21ff, VB 7 p. 463.a.19ff; AVB 40 p. 293.b.8ff; MVB 95 p. 490.a.26, AVB 47 p. 360.b.22) The classification of virtuous *dharmas* according to these two categories is also frequent. (MVB 67 p. 346.a.28, AVB 35 p. 258.a.24ff)

2). **R2** The second classification of “the virtuous” according to the two categories of that having substratum as its effect (*upadhiḥphala*) and that having disconnection as its effect (*visanyoga-phala*) does not appear in any extant Abhidharma text. It is, in part, clarified by a passage from the *Jñānaprasthānaśāstra* (JP T.26.1543 7 p. 851.b.19ff; T.26.1544 12 p. 979.b.23ff; MVB 123 p. 640.b.24ff) describing the effects of *sāsraya* and *anāsraya-vakarma*. Here, *karma* as a whole, including both *sāsraya* and *anāsraya*, is said to have three possible effects: 1) the effect of uniform outflow (*nisyandaphala*) and 2) the effect of maturation (*vipākaphala*), which are themselves *sāsraya* and are produced by *sāsrayavakarma*, and 3) the effect of disconnection
which is anāsrava and may be produced by either sāsrava or anāsravakarma. Dharmasṛi's Abhidharmārthdaya (T.28.1550 1 p. 815.a.7ff) and Upāsanta's Abhidharmārthdaya (T.28.1551 2 p. 843.b.5ff) contain similar descriptions of the threefold effects of karma, but the later Saṃyuktābhidharmārthdayastra (T.28.1552 3 p. 897.b.3ff), after presenting the theory of the threefold effect, adds the two effects—the puruṣakāraphalā and the adhipatiphala—which all together constitute the set of five effects characteristic of Kashmiri Sarvāstivāda-Vaibhāṣīka theory. The two recensions of the Jñānapraṣṭhānastra, and both Dharmasṛi's and Upāsanta's Abhidharmārthdaya present a theory of three possible effects that predates or rivals the theory of five effects typical of the later Sarvāstivāda-Vaibhāṣīka position (MVB 21 p. 108.c.3ff, 121 p. 629.c.4ff).

The “effect of disconnection” mentioned in these passages and in this fragment clearly correspond. However, the identity of the “effect resulting in substratum” (upadhiphalā) mentioned in the fragment with the “effect of uniform outflow” (niṣyandaphala) and the “effect of maturation” (vipākaphalā) is uncertain. Virtually the only occurrence of the term upadhi in the Abhidharma texts is in the terms sopadhiśeṣanirvāṇa, “nirvāṇa with a remainder of upadhi,” and nirupadhiśeṣanirvāṇa, “nirvāṇa without a remainder of upadhi.” (MVB 32 p. 167.14ff, AVB 17 p. 126.a.8ff. See also Schmithausen 1969 pp. 79–81 #2.) The character yi⁹, can be used to translate upadhi, (YBS 50 p. 576.c.27ff) and yiguo, as in the Jñānapraṣṭhāna T.26.1543 (tr. Saṅghadeva), the Abhidharmārthdaya T.28.1550 (tr. Saṅghadeva), T.28.1551 (tr. Narendrayaśas), and the Saṃyuktābhidharmārthdaya T.28.1552 (tr. Saṅghavarman), could then conceivably be the equivalent of upadhiphalā. However, we find Saṅghadeva in the Jñānapraṣṭhāna (T.26.1543 17 p.851.b.20) using yiguo to translate a term for which Xuanzang's translation (T.26.1544 12 p.979.b.25) clearly suggests niṣyandaphala. Similarly, Buddha-varman in the Abhidharmavibhāṣā T.28.1546 (AVB 10 p. 74.c.27) uses the term yigu, where Xuanzang (MVB 18 p. 90.c.1) has clearly translated niṣyandaphala.) The term upadhi appears frequently in Pali suttas and Chinese translations of the āgamas: 1) as that which provides the basis for suffering (MN #26 vol. 1 p. 162, MA 56 #204 p. 776.a.12), or as one link in a succession of factors that give rise to suffering, old age, and death (SN vol. 2
p. 108, SA 12 #291 p. 82.b.10ff (upadhi transliterated); Norman pp. 334–336); 2) as that from which one becomes free in attaining nirvāṇa (MN #16 vol. 1 p. 454, MA 50 #192 p. 743.a.8ff, etc.), and 3) as juxtaposed to attachment, upādāna as in upādhyupādānavinibaddho... (Tripāthī 1962 pp. 45,168; Pali: upa-yupādāna... SN vol. 2 p. 17, SA 12 #301 p. 85.c.22ff).

One reference to upadhi in the Majjhimanikāya (MN #117 vol. 3 p. 72) describing right views (sammādiṭṭhi) parallels its use in this fragment: a contaminated right view (sammādiṭṭhi sāsavā) connected with meritorious action (puññabhāgiyā) has its result in upadhi (upadhīvepakkā), whereas an uncontaminated noble right view (sammādiṭṭhi ariyā anāsavā) is the member of the noble path (maggāngā). Upadhi, as the basis for attachment, is associated with suffering and functions as a component in the causal process leading to birth and death. In this sense, upadhi and visamyojo, or disconnection, represent mutually exclusive categories. However, no passage was found that clearly juxtaposes upadhiphala and visamyojaphala.

3). R3–VI No explicit reference to the pair, upapattihetu and vipākahetu, or to these two as causes producing upadhi was found in any Abhidharma text. However, the canonical use of upadhi indicates that it is clearly associated with the process of rebirth. Further, in an explanation of the meaning of upadhi in the terms, sopadhisesanirvāṇa and nirupadhisesanirvāṇa, the Mahā-vibhāṣā (MVB 32 p. 168.a.1ff, AVB 17 p. 126.a.28–29) distinguishes between the upadhi of defilements (kleśa) and the upadhi of rebirth (upapatti). Although the term vipākahetu, appears frequently in Abhidharma causal systems of all periods, upapattihetu has a much more constricted use. Upapattihetu appears paired with abhinirvṛttihetu, the cause of proceeding; the former refers to the cause of specific rebirth states, and the latter, to the cause that leads to rebirth in general. (AKB 6.3 p. 333.5ff; YBS 5 p. 301.c.7ff, YB Bhattacharya p. 108). (For the pair abhinirvṛtti-samyojana and upapattisamyojana and their relation to the intermediate state and the future rebirth state according to Sarvāstivāda-Vaibhāṣika theory see AKB 3.41 p. 153.16ff.) Saṅghabhadra in the Nyāyānusāra (NAS 49 p. 618.a.13ff) lists abhinirvṛttiḥetu and upapattiḥetu with vipakahetu in a group of three causes: abhinirvṛttiḥetu is the cause of not abandoning, or
not surpassing realms and stages; *upapattihetu* is the cause that makes one be reborn; and *vipakahetu* is the cause that makes one receive the maturation of effects after one is reborn. According to Saṅghabhadra, *abhinirvṛttihetu* and *upapattihetu* differ from *vipakahetu* in that they are causes for the process of rebirth. Though logically one might assume that Saṅghabhadra's threefold division of causes into *abhinirvṛttihetu*, *upapattihetu* and *vipakahetu* is a refinement of an earlier twofold division into *upapattihetu* and *vipakahetu* attested in this fragment, no textual basis for this hypothesis has been found.

4). V1–2 Given the objection of the opponent in V1–2, “if the cause of rebirth were unvirtuous,” the proponent’s statement in V1, *sa ca kusalaḥ*, should probably be emended to read *sa ca kāśalāḥ*, “and that is un-virtuous.” With this emendation, the proponent suggests that the cause of rebirth under discussion is unvirtuous. The opponent’s subsequent objection (V1–3) provides an important clue concerning both the function of the prior distinction between *upapattihetu* and *vipakahetu*, and the opponent’s identity. The opponent’s first point—if this cause of rebirth were unvirtuous, the realm of form and the formless realm would not arise—implies that this cause of rebirth, if unvirtuous, would produce an unvirtuous effect. In other words, the cause of rebirth functions through a causal relation of similarity producing an effect similar to it, as opposed to the cause of maturation, which functions through a relation of difference (MVB 19 p. 98.b.5ff). An unvirtuous cause of rebirth must then produce an unvirtuous effect. This unvirtuous effect could not occur within the realm of form or the formless realm because, the opponent states, “that is virtuous there.” This statement is consistent with the Kashmiri Sarvāstivāda-Vaibhāṣika position that unvirtuous *dharmas* are not found in the two upper realms of the realm of form and the formless realm, and therefore, whatever defilements (*kleśa*) are found there are indeterminate (*avyākṛta*) (MVB 3 p. 14.b.8ff, 38 p. 196.b.12ff, 50 p. 259.c.9ff, 141 p. 724.c.3ff, 144 p. 741.b.4ff; AKV p. 392.32–33). This position opposes the Dārṣṭāntika and Mahāsāṅghika view that all defilements are unvirtuous (MVB 38 p. 196.a.15ff, 50 p. 259.c.9; Masuda 1925 p. 27), and therefore, by implication, that defilements of the realm of form and the formless realm must
also be unvirtuous.

Though the opponent seems to represent the Kashmiri Sarvāstivāda-Vaibhāṣika perspective, the identification of the proponent as a Dārśāntika and the fragment as part of a Dārśāntika śāstra is highly problematic. Despite Saṅghabhadrā's obvious reliance on a written text in his frequent references to the views of the Dārśāntika master Sthavira (Śrīlāta), no fragment of an independent Dārśāntika śāstra has yet been found. Instead, the proponent could well represent the view of another branch of the Sarvāstivāda. Or, this fragment could represent a section embedded in a larger text quoting the views of an opponent who presents his position in a dialogue in which he is the proponent. In that case, the proponent and opponent of the fragment and the larger text would be reversed.

5). V3 The opponent concludes his reasons for the impossibility of rebirth in the realm of form or the formless realm with a scriptural citation in V3: “one is free from desires (viviktah kāmesu).” Though brief, this citation echoes the common formulaic description of the process by which one passes from the realm of desire through the four trance states in the realm of form: “one traverses, attaining the first trance state. . . . . that is free of desires, free of evil and unvirtuous dharmas.” (. . .viviktartī kdmair vviviktam pāpakair akuṣalair dharmmaīh. . .prathamām dhyaṇam upasampadya viharati. Dietz 1984 p. 62; DS 12 p. 512.c.23ff. See also DN #2 vol. 1 p. 73; MN #13 vol. 1 p. 89, MA 25 #99 p. 586.a.18ff; MVB 80 p. 415.a.23ff, AVB 41 p. 311.b.7ff, VB 10 p. 488.a.2ff). One would normally expect vivikta to be construed with the instrumental, as we find in this canonical passage, reflecting the common idiom of the instrumental with verbs of separation (von Hinüber 1968 §149 p. 162; UV 30.28c–d p. 399 kamebhīr vipramuktō . . .). However, in this fragment, the locative, kāmesu, is probably not an anomaly but rather is due either to a confusion of the locative for the instrumental (Edgerton 1953 §.7.30 p. 44, §.7.81 p. 47), or reflects another verbal idiom with kāmesu in the locative. (Sen 1953 p. 410; UV 2.9c p. 114 kāmesu tv apratibaddhaicitta. . .; UV 18.15c p.245 aprtptam eva kāmesu. . .). Since this scriptural passage states that in attaining the first trance state in the realm of form, there
is freedom not only from desires, but also from unvirtuous dharmas, it would provide support for the opponent's suggestion that there is nothing unvirtuous in the realm of form or the formless realm. Remarkably, we find this very scriptural reference used by Sanghabhadra in the Nyāyānusāra (NAS 49 p. 617.a.24ff) in an argument with the Dārṣṭāntika master Stavira (Śrīlāta) in a context identical to that of this fragment: that is, Sanghabhadra attempts to refute Stavira's suggestion that since all defilements are unvirtuous, there are unvirtuous dharmas in the realm of form. However, the same caution noted at the end of the previous section concerning the attribution of this fragment to the Dārṣṭāntika must be repeated here.
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